

METHODIST REVIEW

SEPTEMBER, 1925

WILLIAM ALFRED QUAYLE—AN APPRECIATION

MERTON S. RICE

Detroit, Mich.

IN the very limited confines of this short sketch of the life of a character whose actions awaken inspirations of my sincere affection at every step, it will be impossible for me to place anything other than the briefest summary of my own personal appraisal in appreciation. I may be pardoned the expression, however, of the hope I have, that some soon day I may as a labor of love be privileged to gather into a volume the tracings in derivation and the deliverance in genius of the most unique personality it has thus far in my life been my privilege to know, a man who completely fulfilled that very interesting maxim of Bishop Ingram of London, "Don't be afraid to be human."

This fascinating friend has so consistently carried his genius, and his learning, and his religion, in the fearless naturalness of his individual individuality, that in his presence unique interpretation of profound spiritual truths always seemed to be mere commonplace matters we had always known but never realized, and mere commonplaces, as we had known them, burst into the blaze of profound revelations. That, to me, is the supreme test of genuine learning. Doubtless the most common failure of the scholar is to make his scholarship the matter to be exhibited, and thus not only fail in the accomplishment of that scholarship's best mission, but likewise to make of the scholar an uncomfortable companion in whatsoever surroundings he may be thrown.

My life came under the molding influence of this impressive personality at the most impressionable period for me, and at the

time when he was most rapidly becoming the character destined for leadership in both literature and life. He took an immediate place in interpretation to me, of all those ideals around which my life was to be built, and I write here his name in profound gratitude, William Alfred Quayle, my friend.

In a storm-tossed sea off the coasts of Britain lies a rugged rock-bound isle. Small of compass, it is unique in human contribution. Romance runs riot through its many ravines, and the wild winds that oft blow across it, and the slashing seas that wash its rugged shores, have conspired to produce out of the mingled bloods of its scant population, Celtic and Viking, a peculiar character, physical and temperamental, the Manxman.

America needs the cosmopolitan interpretation of all the people of the world. We could not have America otherwise. Who shall rise up to give us the last and fullest meaning of Americanism? We need every voice, and await the testimony of every land.

This Manxman was, however, American-born, and born far inland too, yet as we used to hold the conch shells to our wondering ears as lads, and fancy we could hear there the echoing sounds of the sea, so in this child of the famous little isle of that northing sea, even though of the prairie born, was to be found all the real evidence of his nativity. We were in no way surprised one day to see *Prairie and Sea*, as the linking title of one of his most fascinating contributions to our treasured list of nature books.

The Americanism which was reflected from this Manx angle was of an intense variety. His ancestry had met life in an atmosphere that grew rugged convictions. Somewhere in my reading I remember seeing the confident reckoning in character-values set down by Barthélemy Saint-Hilaire in which he deftly stated that the English is the best race in the world, no doubt, but that a Scotchman is an Englishman and a half. I would not just here seem to measure values with Saint-Hilaire, but I will venture the estimate that this Manxman in our midst, American-born, American trained, American by instinct, can safely be rated as an American and a half.

Keen appreciation of every genuine value, which is a characteristic not infrequently the resultant of hard circumstances, lies

deep at the foundation of his character. He cultivated his passion for an education from his earliest days, out of the midst of the genuine difficulty of real poverty. There he stood, in circumstances where so many other matters of lesser meaning again so easily commanding demands, and taught to ineradicable conviction in his inmost life the true value of knowledge, as he subjected his body to a frugal living, in order that his always prior soul might be cultivated, and his hungry mind might be brought to an independence of circumstance, and thus set careering a personality that was to become a tourist of the whole universe with God.

Poverty, to which he was born, has never been an insurmountable barrier to a real soul, but has the rather more often proven to be the compelling whip that has driven men from the narcotic of ease, and urged them into the ways of genuine achievement. His native poverty could not forbid his inheritance of the genuine riches of life, which God has always reserved for those who know how to accept it. There are things too big for anyone to own in order that everyone may possess them. The sky, the sea, the wind, the day, the night, the manifold glories of earth are to be had, thank God, and this poor Manx boy discovered that over beyond his empty pocketbook,

He owned a mountain toward the West,
And toward the East an ocean.

Just what a boy will do with the first money he earns is an interesting disclosure in prophetic significance of the coming man. A boy to whom money is enrichingly rare will disclose unusual interest. What did you spend your first money for? would be a revealing inquiry to put to a company of folks. The first money that could be called his own to spend was eagerly exchanged by William Quayle for a copy of Shakespeare. His love of genuine literature was innate. From the proud day he came to own that prized volume, the phrases and characters of the great Elizabethan genius began to find place in his character and conversation, and no voice among us for many years has spoken with more brilliant and impressive interpretation of Shakespeare than his.

To those who have followed the tracery of his vivid pen, the

story of his conversion will be accepted as one of the very finest things he has caught to words for print. He found his first conscious religious experience during an unpretentious and little revival meeting held in a country schoolhouse. Upon an invitation being given in expectant earnestness by the preacher, that little lad arose and walked solemnly down that aisle and humbly bowed his little head, not on a chancel rail, but on a dictionary. He found Christ to his soul, and the dictionary became ever afterwards a most prized book. I have often wondered if his conversion had anything to do with his true affection for words. He asked me one day if I ever read the dictionary as literature. I told him frankly that it had never stirred my enthusiasm as carrying any outstanding evidences of being a masterpiece in the literary estimates. He said, "I love to read it. It is a little disconnected, but very interesting."

The evidence all agrees he loved to read. He read everywhere. A book lured him. He would carry a book affectionately. Someone once said of Lord Bryce, "He has been everywhere, he has read almost everything, he knows everybody." Had I not known it was said of the great Englishman, I would have written it here without any marks of quotation of William Alfred Quayle. He cannot be thought of by those who knew him away from books. It was entirely fitting, too, that on the day he was to be buried his casket was affectionately set amid his choicest volumes, and in his favorite corner of the library.

Dead he lay amidst his books,
The peace of God was on his looks.

Near beside him there lay an unusually beautiful volume of one of his own creations. This maker of books loved the book beautiful. There was always more in a book than simply what it said. This particular book had been made as an expression of appreciation by his publishers. In the rich binding, they had inlaid polished specimens of all the gems that are listed in the verse of the Book descriptive of the City whence he is gone. The book was bound, as the foundations of the wall of the city are garnished with all manner of precious stones, jasper, sapphire,

chalcedony, emerald, sardonyx, sardius, chrysolyte, beryl, topaz, chrysoprasus, jacinth, amethyst, pearl, and pure gold. "Amidst his books." How he did love them. Books were always more than books to him. He owned many copies of the same book. They were always different. I have one of the beautiful volumes of *Pilgrim's Progress* he loved. He had read the mere reading in that famous book many, many times, but in this particular volume he has written, "I read this beautiful book through on my way to dedicate our church at Liberal." He read the words again because the book was particularly beautiful, and that flavored the familiar story. Because one copy of Charles Lamb had the same words in it that every other copy had, failed not to make the copy that was once owned by Alfred Tennyson, and signed by his own hand, and written in by his own interest, of unusual value. It was more than the essays of Lamb, however good and great they might be.

Even amid the priceless volumes of the Bible he possessed, there was to be found an over-plus in its meaning too. Not that the cool critic who might tear translations to pieces in determination to establish the root-word of some obscure phrase, could find any new light here perhaps, but somehow there does gather to the very copy of the inevitable Book a peculiar treasure in the fact that this one he had was owned by Robert Louis Stevenson, and was close at hand when he died. It was good to have a Bible Robert Browning owned. It was a bit commanding to own some of the very volumes that had been bound in chains that their words might not be read by the folks who needed them most, but now with chains still there but broken asunder, to carry the opened Book in hand. More than two hundred of the famous copies of the Book of books were standing in their shelves there beside him, when he went away. They are too valuable to sell, so he gave them away, and Baker University, to which he owed so much, and which owes so much to him, will be the guardian of this treasure of inestimable value.

The limitations of this article forbid all biographical detail. I shall therefore confine myself, in estimate of him, to the four elements of his character that demanded notice as I allowed my personal feelings to express themselves in purely extemporaneous declara-

tion, on the day of his burial. Those four elements that came first to my endeavor in estimate, after more careful consideration I am convinced are the genuine basis of my personal appreciation.

The first outstanding characteristic which evidenced itself in him to all those who came to know him personally was his un-failing recognition of God in the world about him. Not merely in some selected section or season, but everywhere and everywhen he found God. He simply reveled in God. This was the secret of his unfaltering gladness. You cannot obscure the real confidence of God's presence. There were times when tears were on his cheeks, but they had to stand there in the glistening sunshine of his faith.

To sit with this lover of nature, even in the most commonplace place you had ever imagined available, was a passport into the outer bounds of the whole universe and a compulsion to recognize that you were there accompanied by a genuine guide. It was not merely a natural world you were to see either, for the very elements that have been woven into history would be skillfully unfolded to you as you careered and enjoyed the conversation over events that had made a world, as though they were matters of the latest reports from the field. He was all the time making evident the truth of H. G. Wells' saying, "You may start with soap and end in Girino."

There was always an irresistible and natural freshness in the running observations he made, which compelled you to feel the information had just arrived up to the very point where you then stood, and to the very flower that blew fragrance into your face, or to the weed you had carelessly trampled upon, or the bird that fluttered to the hedge as you came.

I do not believe any well-informed man ever wore his information with more modest grace, or ever allowed others to participate in it with less vanity. You simply could not escape the influence of his vast mental equipment, and yet you were never in any manner made to feel that it was on exhibition, for you were constantly lured away from the fact that he was speaking in knowledge, and were made to feel the conversation was all about matters you long had known yourself.

He had a very significant book-plate, which was carefully placed in his beloved volumes. It showed a cliffed shore-line along a sea, I presume a hint of Mauxland. Sailing out, with all canvas set, went a ship. In a circle at the left top corner was the single word "Tentavi," carrying that very significant testimony you always felt about him among his books (which means all literature) that he had gone along with, or accompanied it, in all its leadings and suggestions. Tentavi.

I saw somewhere a suggested list of books that might be advantageously chosen as the most helpful volumes to have, if one were to be cast away on some desert island alone. The discussion which the suggestion provoked led to the attempt to name the most attractive companion with whom to be cast on a desert island that the conversation might not lag. However the decision may have been finally rendered I do not know, but I do know that William A. Quayle would have held high carnival with any island anywhere, with the sky of God overhead, and an ocean splashing along its shores. To him as to Beethoven every tree seemed to cry "Holy! Holy!" and not a blade of grass, nor the commonest thing about him failed to join in the chorus of praise. With an open-eyed expectancy he went everywhere discovering evidence that God was about. In sunshine and in storm, in night and in day, on a mountain or in a mudhole, in an elm tree's gracefulness or in a trampled blade of grass, in a flower or in a weed, there was a sure reflection of the fact of God in all the universe, to this passionate lover of God.

The second element of his life, contributive to his character as he became known to me, was his great clean mind. "Blessed are the pure in heart, for they shall see God." I would not seem to presume in daring to add a new beatitude to the sacred list our Lord has left for us for our exhortation to highest living. I would, however, make bold to place here a beatitude of my own conviction, written for me by the clean mind of this universal tourist. Blessed are the pure in mind, for they shall think God. To the pure all things are pure. You might be inclined to reply to such a statement with the well-known argument Dickens brought against some Calvinistic contentions of his day, and conclude then upon my

sentence that nothing that is is impure. That, however, is not the conclusion in the logic of this seer, whose character always gave color to what he lived beside. In anything that had been stained with evil he saw its perversion. He looked backward there to what it was before the blight of evil had struck it. He brought a clean mind into the presence of all life.

Thank God for a clean mind. I pity the little filthy mind that goes thinking its dirty way about such a world as this. Yet there are those—and who has not had to know them?—whose very laughter we dare not trace, for we know it seeks jest in the thought of the vile. Not so this great clean-minded man. His laughter was everywhere, but was always as clean as the driven snow on mountain crests. It was the gladness of his God in his soul. I have been with him much and oft alone, where the most familiar things of acquaintance would give license to expression, and never have I heard an unclean word slip from his tongue, nor have I ever detected an unclean thought even in insinuation in his speech. He thought clean. He talked clean. He was clean. Such a man is always reshaping the contours of life to those who are fortunate to know him well.

I need not go farther in pursuit of this quality of his life than to tell here an incident which will make beautiful for me many a situation while I live that otherwise might be passed over without notice. I met him early one beautiful summer morning on a train as we were journeying the same whither. The train connections were reputed to be poor, whatever that may mean. Having him with me, however, left me slightly concerned as to train schedules. In ordinary travel we chafe to get to some particular where. When he was along one always felt we were where we wanted to be. We changed cars at a little town in the woods. Trains seldom hunted this town out. Instead of protesting the way of trains, I rejoiced to be left alone a whole day with my absorbingly interesting friend. We had scarce detrained ourselves to the little platform when he suggested we go for a walk. Entrusting our valueless luggage to the station agent, we took for a guide a meandering little river that flowed out into the woods. He wrote a great chapter in his earlier literary ventures entitled "A Walk

Along a Rail Road in June." I have always wished he had left the conversation of this other day along a forest stream in June, for the double wonders it held.

"The poem hangs on the berry-bush, when comes the poet's eye," but it took no berry-bush to rouse this poet. We had poems that day long before we found any berry-bush. He poetized about everything. There was a strange intimacy with nature which he held that did not impress you as rigid and term-bound in the arid manner of the scientist. It was said of George Meredith that "his intimacy with nature was intuition rather than erudition. He did not learn the secrets of nature from without, but seemed to come from the heart of nature bearing those secrets with him." However true that fine word may be of George Meredith I am not qualified to testify. I am, however, prepared to say they could not have been better chosen had they been written to reveal the nature insight of William Alfred Quayle.

In our interesting way beside that little, lovely stream, we arrived at a place where it turned an abrupt corner, leaving a protruding elbow of ground well sodded with soft grass, whose invitation to be seated we were in no mood to deny. We sat down. Everything in eye or ear distance was an immediate interest. Pointing to the edge of the water, just beneath our dangling feet, he said, "Isn't that beautiful mud?" I replied as I now remember that it surely was handsome. He poked sharp fun at my dull vision, and then said, "Let's put our feet in it." I insisted that my feet were comfortable, but that if he held such a desire he should not restrain it where opportunity was so unhindered. Off came his shoes, and into that mud went his feet. After considerable conversation, that would make lovely any page of literature, he stooped over and scooped up a handful of that soft mud and, calling me to judgment, said, "Come here, you skeptic of loveliness, and let your eyes, so blind to beauty, look upon this handful of mud." Directing my attentive interest, he pointed out the sacrifice that had been required to make it. Sacrifice of leaf, whose dead shape could yet be traced. Sacrifice of long surrendered tree, whose crumbled trunk was molded there. The very sand that gave it body was the patient contribution of the slow-yielding rocks

that had yielded to the wearings of the years. Then spying a lovely water flower that had sprung to its rare beauty from roots deep struck in that mud, he plucked it, and, pointing out its delicate workmanship, said, "Little lily, I don't blame you for bringing all the wonders of your loveliness out of such beautiful mud as this." Oh, thank God for the fine, clean mind to look into mud and see loveliness.

Last night he talked with us of far-off things
Around our friendly fire;
Of ships, great seas, and wide adventurings,
To-night he hath his heart's desire.

The third contributive element of his character I would list as wonder. He never allowed wonder to die from his soul. He wondered at everything. That is the fine secret of retaining a never-flagging interest in life. He was interested everywhere he went, for the reason he always took his wonder with him. There were no dull surroundings for him. Swamp, sea, sky, prairie, mountain, everything interested him.

Truth is always wonderful if we but had enough insight to recognize it. The plain blunt reason so many of us do not wonder more is to be found in the fact that we don't know enough. A red-winged blackbird startled him. An eagle amazed his soul. A violet always offered him a purpling cup from which to sip in marvel. One day he stopped me, while he bent carefully down to lift the ripe yellow heads of some blue grass that had completed a career and laid down in golden ripened death. As he held those beautiful fruitions tenderly, calling attention to so much loveliness there, he laid them back in place again as carefully as a mother would cradle a sleeping child. He stopped me one day as we walked across a quite bare thin-soiled hillside, with an exclamation of wonder over an old, stiff, straight-standing stalk of mullein. He stroked those leaves of velvet texture, and discoursed on that erect rough head, filled with seed so dexterously stored against winter for spring that was ahead. Then, pointing to the thin, poor, scant soil from which it sprang, he said, "Don't you think that is doing mighty well considering the chance such a place offers?"

Everything God makes is wonderful if we but knew enough about it. Weeds are only weeds because we have not found them out. Man is a rough workman at his best. His strokes are coarse. Tool-marks are on all he does. His workmanship must be viewed from a distance. Would you see even a masterpiece of a Turner, don't draw near the canvas. Brush marks and daubs of color that offend will greet you if you draw near to man's best workmanship. When God works, however, you cannot get close enough. He is the God of minutiae. Everything he makes is a challenge in a perfection of workmanship. Come close. Bring your most powerful lenses. Set them to your imperfect eyes that you may but get your appreciation the closer to the wonder of it all. Wonder, wonder, wonder; this friend of mine was always a wonderer. There is in the observations of Samuel Johnson a very interesting comment on a great man. "If a man were to go by chance at the same time with Burke under a shed to shun a shower, he would say, 'This is a remarkable man.'" All of which would be true of the character of this sketch, except that he would not have gone under a shed to shun a shower. He wasn't out shunning showers. He would rather have called the shed-sheltered group out into the shower in order to see a shower at its best.

Of all the splendid things Plato has left us perhaps the most impressive is that haunting fancy he wove into the child-man who reached his maturity in a dark cave, and was then brought suddenly into the light of full day, to be intoxicated by the undreamed-of beauties of the universe, that to all of us who have grown up with them have lost their marvel. William Alfred Quayle had never dulled his interest in life by frequent and repeated contacts, but rather had whetted his wonder on an inquiring intelligence, that gave an ever enlarging meaning to everything about him.

I would felicitate heaven on the arrival of this great wonderer. I hope some wonderful day to be privileged to "walk all over God's heaven" with him. He who could see so much of marvel in a lone lean poplar tree standing straight as a sentinel beside a country lane in a prairie place on this earth will be well worth walking with beside the stream of life, with trees on either side.

The fourth and final fundamental of his character I can set

in this sketch is his genuine love of folks. All folks. He loved people. It was so compellingly recognized by all who came to know him that little space will be required to emphasize it here. Someone one time described meeting Phillips Brooks as being "like coming across a passage from the New Testament in the pages of a daily newspaper." This glad, loving man went everywhere as a messenger of heaven's affection. Every speaker at his funeral mentioned this fact. It was a preeminent thing of his life.

Lover of nature as he was, he, however, even there, was constantly dominated by this greater characteristic, as he always found a reflection of his human affections in the things that caught his attention in nature. A lovely sentence in his last book carries what I mean more perfectly than any words I have power to choose. "If ever a daintier thing was thought of by the thoughtful God than the bird's head, tucked under his wing for sleep, I know not what it is, except a babe cuddling to its mother's breast." How that big word "except" does bring us quickly back to what after all was deepest in his appreciation. He loved folks passionately. The fact stood out in unintentional eloquence, which is always eloquence at its best, in an incident attendant upon his very last days. He had gotten so frail of body he could no longer get to church. His pastor, thinking to offer a supply of satisfaction for the enforced absence, suggested getting a radio. He was quick to reply with words that reveal the very inmost cry of his affectionate heart, "I don't want a radio. What I want is the communion and fellowship of the saints." I could tell compelling incidents of his great affectionate pastoral life (for he was ever a pastor, preeminently a pastor), to fill all the pages of this REVIEW. This dominant element is, however, so outstandingly true that it can be said with the unqualified sentence, he loved folks.

My estimate of him is drawn in the influence of an affection which runs across almost all my life. I saw somewhere an estimate of a man who had become great in one line, but might likewise have been so rated in another, and the one who measured him called him a "double first." Men have not infrequently won distinction in more than one field of activity, though a divided endeavor is dangerous to most of us. In our Methodism we hesitate

not to rank now this unique personality in a peculiar estimate. "That a man," wrote Lord Macaulay, "before whom the two paths of politics and literature lie open, and who may hope for eminence in either, should choose politics and quit literature, seems to me madness." William Alfred Quayle did not have to choose between two, for he decided for both. In fact I fear not here to rank him among us a triple-first. Great scholar, preacher; great pastor, Bishop; great man, Christian.

We buried him in the rain. It was well. He loved the rain. We carried his beloved body away while his bell rang in triumph. Forty-three years after he had come into the town an unknown, ignorant, friendless country lad, we were carrying him out, beloved as no one who ever came into the town had been, with a name known round the world.

I will not say him good-bye. I shout across that strange stillness into which he has gone, All hail; All hail, immortal pilgrim.

"A PLACE OF DUSK AND MYSTERY AND MANY DOORS"

WILLIAM ALFRED QUAYLE

(Deceased)

FOR years it has been my unailing custom to read each Joseph Conrad novel (alas! no more: He has sailed the uncharted sea not to return), as it drifted in on the first wave. In one of these sea tales (no matter which) in the early pages my eyes fell on these words descriptive of an unemployed man questing employment, wandering in a basement room of an old London business house which was, says the narrative, "a place of dusk and mystery and many doors." I recall how I was hit in the face of my soul by that phrase as by a breaking sea wave. I did not see the room in which the stranger dimly wandered. The thing that thrilled me was that I had chanced upon what appeared to me to be the most adequate definition of Life I had ever encountered. I think so still. Not a dictionary definition truly, but a deep-sea definition, one where the bravest ships may sail and fear no hidden reef. Dictionaries are not satisfying definers of the vast terms. I would not fault them. They do the best they can. Abstract terms they do well with. Things such as geometry and chemistry they can define. Those invital matters are subject to definition. So gorgeous a thing as life requires concrete exposition which no abstract definition can attain unto and for which only poets are competent.

We may not stand afar quiet as shadows, viewing a remote star, rather must we rush onward on smiting wings like a delayed eagle till we are sweaty as August noons. Then only can we be even on the threshold of capacity to define life. We must not view it but mix with it. Such is the price of expert definition of the infinite thing in which we are all immersed. It wrestles with us as trees are wrestled with by expeditious winds. Nothing can abate that. Even if we would, we could not be free from life, which is an angel that smites us with mighty passing wings. In

this is nothing sinister, rather stimulative and sublime. No abstract view can compel attention.

Life is a magical, mysterious business too big for words to give adequate geography to. They barely may give a dim outline like a full moon glimpsed on summer evenings when the moon is a mere sickle among the stars. This prose poet of the sea whispers, "A place of dusk and mystery and many doors," and his whisper suffices to let our dreams take wings. No semblance of dictionary definitional attempts gibes at us like a Pan's smile on a wood's edge. This is in nothing abstract. Concrete it is as houses and men. We see them in a dim religious light and see we do. Life is no simple thing like a straight road shining in white moonlight: life is perplexing to all who essay it, as intricate and entangled vines. This one thing is fixed: we are here. That we know and is the one fixed fact. For all others we wait. Even birth is hearsay. Someone tells us when we were born. Birthdays are matters of faith. They told us so. We were born is all we ourselves know. We can drop a year and stay where we were though thereby we do not fool the wise years. What we know about life is clearly next door to nothing. We shall stumbling catch up with ourselves in the years as they rush past us. They will give us information of ourselves after we have writ down the things we are. We must wait: the years must wait. They nor we have any gift of prophecy. We must write our little page in a cramped school-boy hand which when written we can barely decipher. "A place of dusk."

Dusk! Life is not a clear day, far prairie line meeting a sky, transparent sunlight shining over all, throwing all things into visibility, eminence and clarity. Never so. We do not run, the light being insufficient. We must walk slowly as becomes the dusk where bats fly on hurrying, slithering wings and owls send their admonitional voices through the gloom. Skylarks do not soar in this gray sky. Room is here in plenty, only light is wanting. Skylarks love the sun. Their flights and song are children of the open opulent day. Who can affirm life is other than twilight? They who walk must take heed lest they stumble. Light enough we have to recover lost footing by, not light enough to keep firm footing.

So uncertain is this dusk as all the ages of mankind have affirmed with sobs and wild cries of bewilderment. When we are young with its morning dew wetting our hair we do not note this dusk and happily trip along our way as if the day were clear. Afterward when we sit and think, we remember how dusk shut our morning in and our future out. We saw so little. We knew so little. Not words or how to walk or where to walk. What to do with hands or feet we could only try to find out. So obscure our entire landscape was; where mountains rose tremendous in the sky, where rivers ran with swift current competent to bear us away hurryingly to death, where the muffled sea hugged the shore, where shining hands beckoned, were hidden as by a low-hanging fog. Nothing was evident. We had to grope. On our knees we made safest journey like soldiers approaching an enemy's line. Whether we could speak or sing or lead a march to better things we knew not. The dusk forbade us. Not that such uncertainty is a calamity, life being a school-ground, not a scene of unmixed hilarity. We are the attempters. We try all keys to find if they have music in them and if we can caress music from them. To a dusk such as we inhabit nothing is far, everything near. The tug of distance is on the soul and the lure of it. We feel we are meant for something and for somewhere far off, only what and where are shut from sight. So many never find what their powers were intended for. They die with their music in them. Maybe they were organists, maybe 'cellists. They have not found out. They did not find their instrument. Or having found, they fumbled. The dusk was too much for them. Dusky as it is we may not wait in one stay. Dim as the road is we must up and on. Continual alertness must attend our frugal speed. We must upward still and onward, though warily as men beset by swords. Our way is haunted by voices, calling in our shadows as one his mother calls. We go; it is toward mountain or desert or sea! We must go, that our feet know. Our sight is holden by our dusk. And it seems white with light to the eager. They try to run and grow bitterly restive if any voice challenge, "Beware." And the feet stumble so often. The Dusk! "A place of dusk." What does that scripture, "We walk by faith, not by sight," mean but this omni-

present dusk? Nothing can be more certain than our human dusk, flout it as we may. Nor do added years, as we might suppose, lessen that gloom so that we grope less and hasten acceleration which may speed us so we may make up for the loitering of earlier years. All the way gropes whether to life or death. "The sad, uncertain rustle of each purple curtain" Poe heard, or thought he heard, is with every traveler slowing eager step or leaping a chasm as if it lay under the midday sun moving along the onward path, nothing daunted, only hindered, climbing in the darkness the mountain range with slippery crags. Adventure diminishes not from this dimness, rather does that dimness stimulate adventure. Certainties do not stimulate us as uncertainties do, we being as we are. The high intent of God is that we should attain unto valor. To climb the high impediment not knowing whether or not we shall attain the crest or die climbing, adds to the achievement. They still attempt the summit of lofty Everest, how many so ever dead men lie in its sunless crevasses. We do not know, wherefore attempt. Stimulate the attempt. No plan so wise for that as God's plan of the dusk. Not conquest but conquest of cowardice remains the apparent purpose of the far-seeing God. Go on we must or die in soul; for the infinite hazard beckons with insistent hands in our gloom.

This dusk has perplexed and will perplex many who persist in seeing their way and resist the believing their way through. Men unwilling to grope are bound hand and foot like a prisoner and the gyves lead many to the leap in the dark; and with no vision, they may not see where the leap may land them nor how far it is across the chasm. John Davidson, poet, past the noon of life and father and husband, took the self-destroying plunge doubtless in such a moment. Since Thomas Chatterton, inspired boy, could not see and had no faith, the madman's act became him. Richard Middleton, young and brilliant poet in actuality and in promise, life all before him, was a suicide. The dusk put the weapon in his hand.

Tennyson's "We have but faith, we cannot see" contains a whole sky of wisdom and hesitance on the verge of homicide. Because we may not see vividly offers no valid excuse for self murder. Hamlet was wiser than he is usually thought to be when

he pondered, lost as he was in dusk, "To be or not to be." Hesitate we may because of the gloom, but take life out of those wise hands which gave it we may not. Speed we may not: self extermination we dare not who have sense of everlastingness. Walk carefully we wisely may who foot it on a seacliff in the gathered dark. To leap from that cliff top may land us in the moaning, drowning sea or on the knife edges of rocks that hide them in the dusk between the mad man and the mad sea. "Walk circumspectly" may well be the motto inscribed on every traveler's thought. Self slaughter is not made mandatory by this cryptic shadow. Napoleon, smitten with such overwhelming catastrophe as history cannot duplicate, was the wise man when he refrained his hand from his own life. Shadows are not a justification of suicide, are rather an invitation to deliberation and lucubration. To go swiftly is not a command of this human pilgrimage but to go cautiously and devoutly. The sky is as imperative for our consideration as the solid ground, nay, more imperative. "Whither bound?" Skyward bound. A path to take leads on the ground and from the ground into the sky, which is always open and insured against casualties. "Dost thou do well to be angry?" was a question put of God long since and might apply to our dusk. No cause to be angry with the intrusive gloaming, though valid cause to be wistful for a Guide. Socrates knew that and said that when his face was whitening with the pallor of his grave. Many things that erstwhile philosopher said and did, we may be eager to forget for our soul's comfort: his firm planting of his journeying feet on the certainty of our being on the earth at a divine commission and not to take us from those unseen yet beneficent hands remains as irrefutable as morning. We wait: we watch, and watch the more because light is dim. To know less than Soerates now is not whimsical but foolish. Though light is poor, we sight the water before our feet, dip in its tides and know feet are meant for dry land and not for the encroaching flood. Watch for the dim path and walk in its dim and narrow track is what Life has to advise all such as are travelers toward the far-off unseen land where journeys end.

And Mystery. We are born for the attempt. Where the at-

tempt may lead is a later chapter which only by gradations we may read. We stub our toes on mystery. Like bulging roots of sturdy trees in a woodland they lie everywhere at our feet. Be we never so wary or so slothful, we encounter them. Men need not to look at stars far off and out of reach of ranging telescopes to find ourselves perplexed, outwitted, nonplussed. The near is as certainly our undoing. What can we comprehend? The least takes us by the throat. That is the glory of life, not to comprehend but to apprehend. Not to notice is our crime. Blindness to a world surcharged with mystery is a misdemeanor. Not what things have we fathomed but what things have we looked in the face and have found them staring at us with unrecognizing eyes is our august exploit. What we don't know is our actual wisdom. The little child knows everything and tells his father glibly because he is such a funny little ignoramus. To have grown tall in intellectual stature is to have crossed the track of innumerable mysteries. We are actual agnostics. When Franklin tried to know about lightning was his moment and movement of greatness, and not when his experiment succeeded. To know we do not know is our entrance on the curriculum. The face haggard with finding is not sublime as the wistful face of question mark. The attempt to shun mystery is certain sign of the juvenile mentality. Least things stagger us with definite certainty as the remote and astounding star clusters. We are hit between the eyes with the doubled-up fist of the not-understood. Scholarship is begun when we know we need to know. Then is school entered never to let out. "No dismissal" is written in stern capital letters across this door. We be the race of the un-dismissed. Matriculants we are: graduates we are not. Not diplomas but a little front seat in a schoolroom wider than any sky is what we need and all we shall get. Death is a passing into a larger room than any we have encountered. The great day is our matriculation day. Then the fine white flame of the quest runs along our veins; and we dream dreams from which can be no awakening. "What land is this?" we whisper, and, the name found, our feet have passed the frontier of another unnamed land. Always a new unadventured land lies truculent as burnt with fire and turbulent with sinewy earthquake. Mystery

is the only name of any continent whereof to boast. Columbus knew not what land his keel grated against. He had to hunt for a name. That is the fun and battle of the enterprise. What do we know? Much and that much-struggled-to and made-mistakes-over. That rivers ran in our mortal bodies was discovered after so many blundering years as to make Harvey's discovery appear like a crooked jest to make sport of the race with. Or the sphericity of the world, the moon had to be interrogated to find that out; and Magellan lost his life to see whether the moon had told the truth. Life, a mystery. The world, a mystery. What the constituents of this world is mystery. The growth of flowers and grass and trees is as mysterious as at the beginning. We talk glibly but mainly to hear ourselves. No one else knows enough to call out to our persiflage, "Liar."

We love to think we know things. We discourse fluently about Nature doing thus and thus to find later she does or does not, and then the major matter rushes at us like a mountain in motion saying, "Who makes nature so wise?" We must always run up against "Who" if we mean business. Inanimate things must be wiser than folks if they do all attributed to them. We are not in quest of mystery. Mystery runs us down, plays with us as a reed is played with by the summer winds. Whichever way we turn it is to encounter lions playing with us. The mysteries must have their fun; and many a jest is in their joke book. We look sagacious, if we can, fooling no sphinx encountered. Animals are mysterious. Slight the wonder that wise old Egypt thought them gods, seeming so wise and saying nothing; not contradicting their looks. I have seen men so till they opened their lips. Wise birds and beautiful retaining every family trait while centuries waste. The nightingale Keats knew made its same ancient moan when Ruth lost heart in a foreign land. "Why?" "Why?" an age-long "Why?" for every living thing, beast, bird, flower, tree, worlds, man. They evoke our uttermost wonder. Man, any man strikes us dumb, when we think. The wonder is not that the unusual man is so unusual: the wonder is that the usual man is so unusual. What powers he has, how deep the usual man may at any moment become, what mountains of self sacrifice may rise gaunt, tre-

mendous on his horizon, what deeps of sin and selfishness may dig dizzying chasms in his soul, what theme for fiction is in him because he is more diverse than all fiction. Enoch Arden is no romantic dream; he existed just as a star shines. Wherefore shake hands with mankind, so rugged, so ragged, so gigantic, so abysmal. We are on the road and looking, eyes wide open, wonder-lit. The way entrances us so because we know not in what wonder any step may engulf us. How flowers forget not what bloom is expected of them, or trees of what perfume of wood, what leaf, what bark, what stature? I find it hard to encounter them for sheer wonderment. They grow to pattern so, are not discouraged under whatever untoward circumstances, are silent and courageous so that they challenge perpetual wonder of our minds, and fairly set brains staggering round in a maudlin dervish dance. Then the things of man in his long tired history dizzy us as with a vertigo. That shorthand was used to immortalize Marcus Tullius Cicero and Pepys and John Wesley in letter and diary when, as Pepys, he wrote for perpetual secrecy and would have cut right hand away rather than to have been translated into the scrip of the open day. Mystery that Benvenuto Cellini, goldsmith, who in his craft was so vainglorious and swaggering and gifted, should have achieved an immortality outranking his graver's art in an autobiography whose braggadocio vagabondage is among the amazements of mankind, ungrammatical, boastful, lying, as is firmly believed, and apparently with reason. Vain as he was, no dream of his ever rose to guess at this posthumous immortality. He threw his autobiography in the world's face. And now the romance of manuscripts which have been in wash of many seas to be found at last by some chance wanderer on the lonely shore as the Paston Letters during the reign of Henry VI, Edward IV, and Richard III, 1422-1509, or George Cavendish's "Life of Cardinal Wolsey," or those leaves of Robert Herrick's poems that sing as winds sing through summer trees. Not what's lost but what is not lost—all wonder. This mystery of manuscripts that, dead, refused to die, would make a romance dimming Arabian Nights if set down in a book. Or how those seeing eyes of Ralph Waldo Emerson for many closing years should have wandered un-

seeing along all roads so that attending the funeral of Longfellow, a friend of many years, he whispered, "The gentleman has a beautiful face," and passed on as in a dream, or that John Ruskin, sayer of things which should have been said and as nobody else said them, spent his last years in a wandering fog of the brain, or how James Smethan, painter and Methodist class leader, serene of faith, forward of look, balmful as an evening wind blowing across a meadow of new-mown hay, writer of letters so filled with the grace of sight and saying as to be among immortal things, should have ended life muttering the listless, disconnected words of settled, sightless melancholia—these things are to be set down on the yellow desert sands beside the slow-miling Sphinx whose secret remains forever unknown. What a mystery it is that John Morley, confessed agnostic, proud to be so, though not noisy, has written *The Life of Gladstone*, which must be counted one of the great Christian biographies of all time and Gladstone as one of the manliest and most crystalline characters who ever put life's powers to statesmanship or manhood. Him an agnostic has followed lovingly and smilingly along his heavenly path.

Two things in the enticing village of New England, Amherst, had their way with my imagination as a sunset river does, a bronze statue of Henry Ward Beecher on Amherst College campus and the fact that here lived and wrote Emily Dickinson. Beecher was an eagle with the mighty, far-soaring wings and voice that filled the sky, the most Shakespearean mind that America has produced, and his Alma Mater is, as she may well be, in a continual flush of pride at remembrance of him. Emily Dickinson was a dove and far-soaring too. Doves fly fast and far and toward heaven. She was a hidden voice in a coppice, very sweet and haunting. Two wondrous things this village had not to its knowledge when it had them. They were subtle mysteries.

Among contemporaneous mysteries with myself I place this: that the intelligentsia, so called and not infrequently self called, do so constantly fall on the side of things off color in Americanism, Bolshevism, morals in literature, atheism frying up dirt as literary riches, lauding putrid Oscar Wilde, red in anger at the attempt to make a nation sober, a bravest governmental attempt of all the

ages, thus setting their stomach in the midst as a god to be worshiped, standing as virtual opponents of moral things and sneering at "the Victorians," boasting invaliantly of things new and dirty as being the discovery of literature, sneering too at the Miltons, the Shakespeares, the Ruskins, in general at such as created English literature and will remain the immortals when these silly vaporings are sped away like scurrying clouds. Egotism does not sound well ages off. Megaphones are not a necessary acoustical equipment. Russian or French or German or English or American realism may be washed away in the rain of years like any other dirt.

Set down as a mystery of history that an era so foul as the eighteenth century incontrovertibly was in one country, and that an island, William Pitt, Edmund Burke, Sam Johnson were as clean as sea winds and as far removed from contemporaneity as equator from pole. Taylor of "Holy Living and Dying" fame lived in the effluvial Carlovingian age. Mysteries these or more like miracles. Pause and wonder: explain we cannot. We may learn not to be carried away by the spirit of the times and not to be submerged by them. Things off color are not literature or life.

The mystery that life must walk years through with hand fast holden in the hand of death and that death with its eyes never opened goes outward, upward, hands, both hands, held in the warm palms of Life—that mystery salutes our ears and our hearts, indubitable mystery and age-long, only to add to the wonder of life so that we name death "the great adventure." Joseph Conrad, dropping his insufferable surname, named himself Conrad, which was part of his given name.

And Many Doors. Joseph Conrad in himself demonstrated the accuracy, over many, of this view. A Pole by birth and rearing, a sailor and an Englishman by choice, not headlong but studied, his name was Jozef Konrad and then a "Korzen" plus "owski," a name as long as the State of Delaware. Born in 1857, not till 1878 did he touch British soil, at which time he knew no word of English. In 1924 he died, so that between 1878 and the date of his death he mastered the English language and the seas so that he became such a seer of the sea as, I think, we have had

no other, and wrote his adopted language with such facility that he was accounted a distinguished novelist and a writer in English so lovely that by many he was writ down as the great English fiction writer of his time. "Falk," "Lord Jim," "Youth" and "The Children of the Sea" are to be ranked among the world's finest masterpieces. "The Children of the Sea" I account the sublimest picture of the sea at storm ever written. Its waters boil on not to know quiet while this world lasts, while his Oriental seas retain the romance, hush, glamour, nepenthe, to put one asleep even under the fierce equatorial light. Thus Joseph Conrad has found a door and pushed it wide open, though impossibility had its huge shoulder leaning within to keep the door shut. One of the many doors this sea-going man with ocean spindrift in beard and hair lunged against full-strengthened and flung it wide open so the salt winds blew through! Write down "Many Doors" in the lexicon of human endeavor. Many there are.

Charles Dickens (renowned and distinguished despite all recent lifted eyebrows of self-styled literary egotists), as a little boy working over some sort of blacking and attempting writing advertisements therefor, en route to a popularity in England and America which reads like a fairy tale rehearsed at twilight, and stands to-day as an advocate of man, woman, child, regardless of ancestry, in a land buried in ancestry, may push open one of the closed doors which stands looking gloom on the halls of life.

Let John Masefield tune his sea-breaker voice to hearten the dull faith of such as think soul chance dead or near to die. A human cipher one day and a thrilling human poet-voice the next may declare with singing voice "Another door." Strachey's *Life of Queen Victoria*, with its true and muddy recital of the dreary shabbiness of George IV, William IV, and the rest of the so-called royal family, as grimy as London swallowed up in fog and mud, in the sorry hunt to find some decent human to set up as king, eventuated in securing a queen who while bound hand and foot by pride of royal prerogative and German narrowness, yet rose to the sunny eminence of being good, opens a door wide to hope and song.

Edward Bok, Dutchman; Jacob Riis, Dane; Ludwig Lewi-

sohn, German, came through untold struggles and penury or loneliness to be men of mark in a foreign land and helpers in the new world of human opportunities. "Push open the shut doors," these men shout in a chorus which the generations may hear.

The friendship of Theodore Roosevelt and Henry Cabot Lodge, men as different as Mark Twain and William Dean Howells, which endured every strain ever put on political friendships and stood taut as a cable on boiling waters of tempest, pushes the door of friendship wide open till a sky of sunshine rushes through. John Hay, a secretary at an office door, though secretary to a great man, survived the handicap of marrying wealth and became practical inventor and announcer of international fair dealing which will ever stand as "American diplomacy." The door! How Walter H. Page came to be writer, publisher, war-time ambassador, wrote letters from the scenes of the planning of world campaigns of battle and diplomacy so that while he barely reached his beloved America in time to die on the soil of his nativity, those letters have swung him high as a sun into posthumous fame and will doubtless make him a citizen of the ages, is a story fit to be told in the halls of fame for unborn generations. "Many doors."

Such doors as these are commonplace compared with those which stand democratically so they may be entered of all men. Manifestly some doors may be opened only by the unusual hand. Ordinary men may not do all extraordinary things. Genius is still a word to conjure with. No socialism may demolish the constituted facts of life. To ignore those facts is to set a fool's cap awry on the brow. Some of these many doors are for the gifted few who can. Some doors may be opened by the Cromwell and the Milton men, though I do not account these to be main entrances. The many are the people who greatly count, who fill the heavens and outshine stars.

To stand on some great day of eternity and see the procession of common men and women crowd golden streets will set the angels singing. Common people eligible to the select honors of the Deathless Land. O that will be glorious! Those doors of pearl whereof we have had a fleeting look are for the very many.

They can open them. The everlasting doors are those which may be pressed open by unusual folks, where there is no caveat written anywhere. Wherefore let men everywhere rejoice. Their turn has come.

Many Doors. The door of sight things beautiful: of earth and sky, moon and stars, sunup and sunset, of flower and tree, river and brook, prairie and mountain. Everybody's door. Who is refused admission? Who may not use the eyes he has to behold things? that hold out warm hands of welcome to every passer by. All things lovely stand ready to be rejoiced in. I will be glad to have seen in my wanderings under the blue dome of sky, perceptible betterment in the many taking to heart the things of God. More look on high and pause beside the road to take things humble yet lovely to the heart. It requires no special endowment to feel at home among the common ways where loveliness is special pleader. A child may push this door wide open. The tired may open weary eyes to see what time they rest folded hands on weary knees. Forever at everybody's door is this spring wonder of the accustomed which puts fingers on eloquent lips of praise. Beyond all words, to-day stands with wide-apart lips ready for a song. Birds are not as gleeful as human hearts that barely look and see. Then the sunny song! We have no need to go to find things to bring us to our knees: staying where we are by sea, by desert, by little hills, by slanting plain, by soaring mountain, under drifting cloud, in driving rain, under gathering dark, by starshine, in winter's storm, by purple dayspring, all things we value most throw kisses from their finger tips to blow upon our lips. This is the economical way of being Turners without the trouble of mixing paints. This door!

The Door of Dreams. Imagination keeps open house and turns nobody from the door. How invitational this door is. Wordsworth at his most seeing moment was not our superior. Keats and Shelley were our fellows and Stephen Phillips our playmate in this land of dreams. We too have wings which may spread in this sky. No life need be unaccompanied with a dream. This long and shining road leads on from every door, past every door. We may entertain our dream. "Snow Bound" is anywhere;

any time; and its winter winds whine at every casement if we do but see the door to be swung open at a touch. It never is far to The Forest of Arden, nor to that chamber the name of which is Peace. John Bunyan found it on a muddy road scarce a county away. Happy door of dreams, I open thee.

The Door to "Whatsoever things are pure and of good report." Who may not enter? The golden door of being pure than doing purely. Being must precede doing. We must not reverse this divine order. To be very diligent in doing without the preceding being can end only in pother or disaster. "Blessed are the pure in heart, for they shall see God" was said by Him who made no mistakes in the logic of life and stands after these centuries of years the unimpeachable order for the soul. New psychologies cannot reorder this divine psychology of a righteous soul. As it was then so it is now. The being-pure heart is antecedent of the pure deed. Of the pure deed we have need enough, not such need as substitutes doing, being busy, for being good with its inevitable consequence of doing good to all men. Occupied hands are not a satisfactory account of life behavior. After stars are lit they shine. Lighting stars or suns is the major task. We shine on being lit. The pure heart is might calling for no revision. Who may not open this heavenly door? So many have and with hands not skilled as men would reckon though the product was skilled workmanship beyond a lapidist's cunning. "Whatsoever things are pure," push on the door my soul, every soul. A world waits for that open gate. Without this, nothing counts. The pure heart is the God heart! God's heart is the calm port to which all ships must steer if there are to be safe sailing and happy voyage and full sails puffing with favoring gales. Show the soul to whom all things pure make immediate and mighty challenge and we shall have security for human future. Other way is there none. Busy activities lead to blustering laboriousness. Pure hearts striving with clean hands and seeing eyes insure progress and are likely to proceed noiselessly toward their destined haven. Those who stay enthroned in human regard are those who have pure hearts. Goodness is at premium in this world's marts, outlasting obelisks.

The Door of Books. Books to be borrowed (and returned as

becometh an honest man), by all means borrowed, books to be owned, by all means own books, a few if no more, books to be read hastily, books to be re-read loiteringly, books to be owned and loaned as Jean Grolier did, books to be read for knowledge or brooding, tattered books with bindings which shall have seen rough usage and rude ways of travel and far ways, books bound in rare bindings fit to warm the hands by in bleak winter days and the eyes to kindle at sight of, new books with the smell of press and bindery fresh on them, old books to fondle and smell as we smell a pressed flower, books to be marked in reading and thus retain reminders of a reader's first impressions, books to have leaves turned down in token of familiarity and ownership, books to be read out-of-doors and books to be read indoors with the curtains down and night shut out and the lamp burning with a warm and kindly glow, incunabula with their perfume and far-off dates, manuscripts illuminated by hands long ago folded on a silent heart, books to be held in the hands and not looked inside of, books to be carried in the pocket for largess of love, folios too weighty to carry and twelvemos too small to be burdensome, books from ownerships unknown save an ancient owner's name written with slender pen craft on a dim title page full of romance of ownership and the sadness of booklovers that die, books to be crooned over like babies, and books to be shouted over like a great victory, many books, few books, books with all the haunting quality of dead authors who squeezed their cluster of grapes into this one goblet, books temporary as blooming violets. The door of books, everybody's door leading everywhere and always up hill where the view is to the far-off and hazy.

The Door of Love for Fellow Man. To walk with meditative head bowed and looking no man in the face, interested in none, loving none, is a sin God will find it hard to forgive, himself loving man so incredibly and for so long and only just beginning and finding man so full of wonder and purity and splendor like a sunburst. Misanthropes hate men, thereby disclosing their egotism and selfishness, though to the lasting credit of mankind be it said there are not many misanthropes; many simply do not think their fellows interesting and are to be set down as ignorant. He who

knew men best loved them most and carried expectation for them to the nth power. Seeing we must live and suffer and rejoice with men and after that die with them, our highest wisdom is to garden them as we do flowers, grow them as we do trees. The human race is immensely interesting and immensely lovable. Foibles, sins, weaknesses they have, so have we, hence their attractiveness is enhanced by these things and we feel singularly at home in their company. Love men and women: do not glower at them when scowls are so unbecoming and bring wrinkles before their time and lest we should be found to be making faces at ourselves. Cynicism has never traveled far into the inland of the soul, whereas love and laughter with men and at them has traveled very far inland and upland. Cynicism is always cheap and lean and mean. Enjoy men, for fellow man is rich like a golden harvest. We be harvesters. The door to a whole race of striving men, brave women, crying and laughing children! No lonesomeness on this road nor any ennui. It thrills as with hidden fire. Open this door.

The Door, the Sublimest Door. I remember that one like unto the Son of man with never a catch in his breath said, "I am the door," and he is. No such door has ever been ready to be pushed open and none so easily pushed open. Little children have, and men groping in darkness and winter cold and women whose strength was only weakness have swung this sublimest of all doors on its noiseless hinges. Life and joy, spring and fall, have found this door convenient to their need and those needing a refuge have fallen full length against this door to find it open inward and to life. Laughter as well as tears have found themselves at this door, which was as the entrance to their own mother's house save that there was no shadow, only light, smiling deathless daylight, whose other name is Everlasting Life.

WILLIAM ALFRED QUAYLE AS A MAN OF LETTERS

COLIN C. ALEXANDER

Baldwin, Kansas

THERE has recently been initiated a movement to establish at Baker University an endowment in honor of Bishop Quayle, to be known as the William Alfred Quayle Foundation in English Literature. This step makes especially timely an examination of Bishop Quayle's relation to literature, a relation more wide and varied than many, even among his friends and admirers, realize. He was a lover of books, and surrounded himself with one of the most remarkable libraries to be found, aside from those of the millionaire collectors, and one which might well prove the envy of even collectors of great wealth. He was, moreover, not only a collector but a writer of books, having to his credit more than twenty volumes, covering the fields of religious and social thought, literary criticism, nature books, and poetry. He has long been a contributor to periodicals, and continues to contribute, as is shown, for example, by his recent article in this REVIEW, entitled "The Haunting Quality."

If it be asked how it is possible, within the limits of a brief paper, to present even a cursory survey of this field, the answer is that, numerous and varied as his writings are, they nevertheless have an underlying unity of purpose which will furnish the key to an understanding of them.

What is that underlying unity of purpose?

Carlyle quotes Fichte as saying that the function of the man of letters is to reveal to men "the divine idea of the world." To the mass of men, he thinks, this idea is not recognizable. But the man of letters is sent hither especially that he may discern for himself, and make manifest to men, this divine idea. He is to reveal "the imperishable divine significance that lies in the being of every man, of every thing—the presence of God who made everything." Fichte and Carlyle have their own way of understanding and explaining all this. Bishop Quayle has likewise his

understanding and interpretation of this divine idea. It is the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man as revealed by Jesus Christ. To portray this truth in his own works and to point it out in the writings of others, to cause men in their everyday walk and callings to see it, feel it, and believe it—this is the underlying theme, expressed or implied, in all of his writings about men, about books and about nature. This it is which, whatever the subject he treats, gives unity to his varied writings.

This characteristic attitude is shown most strikingly in his estimate of Shakespeare. While according the world dramatist unbounded praise for his many-sided greatness, Bishop Quayle does not fear to point out what he regards as Shakespeare's limitation:

"We shall never overestimate Shakespeare," he writes, "because we cannot. Some men and things are beyond the danger of hyperbole. . . . Shakespeare saw the abyss of shame as well as the tall hills of grace and purity, and portrayed all. . . . He is the exact contrary of being immoral. Coarse he was, when measured by our higher standards because he did not wholly rise—though he rose far—above his age in this regard. He is no voluptuary; is always sensuous, but never sensual. . . . He is love's poet. His lovers are imperishable because real. He is love's laureate."

So much in praise of Shakespeare's greatness. The quotations, however brief and inadequate, reveal the enthusiastic admiration with which he regards Shakespeare as a writer. But the account is not complete; we must have the whole truth. One defect must be noted:

"Yet are his loves of this world. Plainly Shakespeare was a voyager in this world, sailing all seas and climbing tallest altitudes to their summits, but one flight was not native to him. I cannot think him spiritual in the gracious sense. . . . There is in him worldliness, but not otherworldliness; his character not seeming to the full to have a sense of the invisible world. . . . Of a good man like Job there is no trace in Shakespeare, or that he ever thought of such a man is dubious. By the phrase 'good man' I understand a man whose controlling impulse is God and who would honestly translate him into the common vernacular of life. Such a man Shakespeare never did portray, nor, in my judgment, could he have done so had he tried."

This same discrimination marks his discussion of his favorite among the American poets, James Russell Lowell. To call Lowell

his favorite does not necessarily mean that, in any academic sense, he ranks Lowell higher than the others. It means that aside from the fact that he has written a book about that poet, he utters so many appreciations of Lowell's humor and staunch Americanism as revealed in his essays, letters and poems, that a reader gains the impression that Lowell is a favorite, if not *the* favorite. Certainly his praise of Lowell as the most many-sided of American men of letters is frequent and emphatic. "America's representative poet, James Russell Lowell," he says, "was editor, essayist, diplomat, poet—in every department distinguished." He praises also the religious and moral tone of Lowell's poetry, remarking that the truths to be obtained are not so much contained in certain lines as diffused throughout the poems.

But mark, as was said, the final test which he applies to one of Lowell's poems, a test which he will not let even a favorite writer escape. Speaking of "The Cathedral," he says:

"The doubt element is the expression of the age. . . . The atmosphere is accurate. We fault not that. But where the fault lies in a Christian poem is, it fails because it does not go far enough. . . . We are sorely disappointed. There was room for the lift of the eagle's wings, but they were not lifted. We left sunlight to enter the fane; we never recovered the lost sunlight. . . . Himself was at a loss what to call the poem. . . . Let us have a hand and name it once more, from the lost light of it, 'The Lost Sunlight.'"

This poem, almost alone of Lowell's, has the skeptical tone, and this poem alone meets with disfavor.

From the foregoing citations of comments upon the English and the American poet it is clear that the quality which Bishop Quayle ranks highest in literature is the spiritual. This, however, must not be confused with mere didacticism. Upon that point he is specific. He says: "Let it be frankly stated, this is not the roomier way. Didacticism and poetry are not best neighbors." But the spiritual is a presence felt, a consciousness of "the divine idea." This quality he finds in a notable degree in two poets about whom he has written some of his best comments, Robert Browning and Francis Thompson.

Of Browning he writes:

"Aside from Shakespeare I have read no poet who inspires as Brown-

ing. He misses no element of power and in particular he does not miss the chief fact of soul. Shakespeare has no women as Pampilia; indeed, universal literature has not her like. She is the noblest female figure given us by creative genius."

Browning's notable qualities are thus summed up:

"Browning is virile. We know it is a man's voice we hear. Allow his strength to be duly outlined in the following enumerations: Fecundity, wealth of theme; knowledge, and thought; dramatic power; profound psychology; Christian attitude; and inspirational value."

His praise of Browning is almost without qualification. Almost, but not quite: "His lack of sense of proportion grew out of his surprising affluence of thought. He sees all, and will tell all. . . . His genius needed narcotic, not stimulant. . . . His very genius was his hurt."

Finally, he praises Browning for a quality not always associated with genius, the quality of sanity. Many poets of ecstasy, Shelley, for example, have shown a lack of balance in their dealings with the actual world of men and women. Bishop Quayle sees in Browning a rare combination of genius and levelheadedness. "I lay down as one of the canons for testing a poet's greatness this: 'Is he sane?' and purpose applying the canon to Browning. I assert that he bears the test. No saner man than Browning ever walked this world's streets."

It is the opinion of the present writer that Bishop Quayle's appreciation of Francis Thompson is one of his most notable contributions to the field of literary criticism—in insight and interpretation his best single critical essay. Of Thompson, whom he calls "a poet Chrysostom," he says memorable things in memorable words. The key to his love for Thompson is to be found in the following words: "Where Francis Thompson is we are never in the presence of anything but souls. I feel Rossetti and Morris in 'The Blessed Damozel' and 'The Defense of Guinevere' to be spirituelle rather than spiritual. I feel Francis Thompson to be spiritual rather than spirituelle. . . . Francis Thompson stays where the depth is under him, and the height is over him. . . . If you were to hang Francis Thompson's immortality on a single hook, that hook would be 'The Hound of Heaven.'"

Poe says that in order to appreciate to the full a piece of literature one must read it "with a kindred art." When one reads Bishop Quayle's essay, "A Poet Chrysostom," one feels that the writer has read Thompson with a kindred art. Witness the following observations:

"Depths are in him down which the rays of light vainly finger. . . . He has an essential love of color. . . . He blows upon the trumpet of the sea. . . . Almost the truthfulest word I can express my own feelings in over these poems is that their glory reminds me of a turbulent sunset sea after the storm, when every wave is a new episode of variant fire, while beyond you remains a wave all fire, you sag with the fiery sea, and float on a wave passionate as lava, yet are not consumed. . . . There is such a splendor thrown about any event as that we feel that were we qualified with inner knowledge, we should find a larger field than we now perceive."

Finally, the quotation of the notable passages from the best poems, as illustrative of the poet's powers and qualities, is a valuable anthology of great passages from Thompson. The citations show the keen insight and sympathetic appreciation of one who has read this Christian mystic with an understanding heart.

Among other poets Burns and Tennyson in England, and Longfellow in America are most referred to and apparently are most admired. Walt Whitman, in spite of "the good gray poet's" love of the out-of-doors, he treats with small regard. "His ideas are scant as December leaves." Emerson he likes because of that writer's companionship with stars and love for the open; but the sage of Baldwin stops a long way this side of worship of the sage of Concord.

His comments on prose writers are interesting reading. Lamb he likes, a fact made evident not only by his appreciative comments on that lovable eccentric, but by the rare *Elia* which he treasures among his books. Hazlitt, much neglected by the multitude, and even by the cultured few until recently, he gives unstinted praise. Hazlitt, he says, has the quality of making a reader feel at home. "You feel like taking off your things to stay. He is not on a pedestal but, like a genial host, at the door." He

regards Hazlitt as "the most stimulating Shakespearian interpreter save Coleridge only."

Among American writers, he holds, the best work has been done in prose. He praises the letters of Lowell as revealing in a charming manner a varied personality and a well-stored mind. But he says, "America had no poets who stood the peer of Browning and Tennyson, and among novelists our Hawthorne could not be said to surpass a Thackeray, a Dickens or Eliot." In one field, however, he gives America pre-eminence; the field of historical writing. "Say proudly," he declares, "beyond the seas were no historians the masters of Bancroft, Prescott, Motley, and Parkman." On these, he thinks, will rest America's chief claim to distinction in the field of literature.

His nature writings are, perhaps, as widely read, in Kansas at least, as any of his other works. When, ten years ago, the writer of this paper began to become acquainted with the minds of young men and women of Kansas who were just entering college, he was struck with the fact that these young people were better acquainted with Bishop Quayle's nature books than with any other non-fiction literature of to-day. The reason is, no doubt, twofold; these books not only reveal new glimpses of things with which the young people are familiar; but they also express the perennially youthful, sympathetic heart of the writer. Certainly *In God's Out-of-Doors* is a familiar companion in many homes of Kansas and the Middle West.

One of the appeals of these books to the public at large is that they are without pretense or pedantry. Bishop Quayle disclaims any intention of setting up as a nature writer in any scientific or professional sense of the term, yet he manifests a keen power of observation. In his comments he is nothing if not individual; and his words have often a quaintness and pungency which reveal the personality of the writer. For example:

"Everybody owes it to oneself to get freckled, and to get freckled you must get out of doors. . . . The bark of elms, in corrugation and tint, is enough like the ruts of dry country roads to be accused of plagiarism. . . . Summer is the trees' furlough; winter is their campaign—one long battle by night and day. . . . When the gray clouds are just above the treetops it is as if you looked at every tree against a background of

gray granite. Give me a gray day with its all-day twilight and the naked night of forest, and I will not envy kings their coronation."

"Emerson says that contact with the earth is medicinal. But Emerson did not say all of the truth. We do not need medicine much of the time. I will advance my friend Emerson's dictum, affirming that contact with the earth is dietary. We must all eat. Now contact with the ground is one way man 'can live without dining.'"

Bishop Quayle's message is constantly "Get out of doors." For recreation, for sanity, get out of doors; but also for the reasons expressed in these words from *In God's Out-of-Doors*: "Some people do not well know that God is out-of-doors. I marvel at them. . . . He made the out-of-doors and loves it, and haunts it, as Jesus did the mountains and the sea."

Of his poetry there is space for only a brief discussion. Most of his verse may be included under the heads of devotional and nature poems; but such divisions are by no means mutually exclusive, for his devotional poems reveal the sense for nature, and his nature poems are full of the spirit of devotion. His attitude toward poetry may best be revealed in his own words:

"Prayer I assume to be the highest expression of the human soul, and next to prayer is poetry. . . . If a poet sees at all he is likely to take a hill view. He gets the great truths as the sun gets sight of the mountains. To be with such lightseers is to fill the soul with windows open on every street the wide world has."

Of his nature poems, "When April Heals Wild Winter's Scars" is one of the best. The last stanza, especially, has a rhythm and power altogether admirable:

The whirling planet springs to birth;
The dumb earth flames to mirth of stars:
There is a prophecy in earth
When April heals wild winter's scars.

"Wild Clematis" contains an image not often surpassed in our present-day verse:

The wild vine clambers at its will,
And sprays the rock with foam of flower.

But the poem which, as a whole, reveals, more than any other the artistic powers of the writer, especially his sense for light and color, is "Desert Goldenrod."

Beneath a sky immeasurably blue,
Where barren sun-drenched wastes give back the night
And desert owns the valley and the height,
A desert goldenrod exultant grew.
Upon its ardent fires no drop of dew
Had ever dripped, nor ever any night
Had come to lend it shadow or affright:
But all its lifeblood from the day it drew.
A groupèd splendor like a central sun;
A rank, exultant clamor of strange flame,
A yellow fire like desert town at bloom,
A gaudy emblem of wild triumph won,
A subtle glory for the which no name—
A rapture of the desert fire and doom.

Of his many devotional or religious poems, two are especially notable. One is entitled "I Care Not." The other, especially characteristic of the mind and heart of the writer, is here quoted in full:

The shadows lengthen; it will soon be night.
Against the western mountains blackness crowds,
Though glory makes the eastern sunset bright,
The stars will soon be flocking, clouds on clouds.

My shadows lengthen; it will soon be night.
My groping call will mingle with the wind.
Howbeit I shall clamber, height on height,
And everlasting sunrise duly find.

In conclusion it may be said that Bishop Quayle combines breadth of interest and variety of theme with a trenchant discrimination in his treatment. He is not to be hypnotized nor awed into swallowing any writer whole. He reports his own adventures in his many and varied journeyings and literary parleyings, and has evidently enjoyed his experiences and hopes that others may have the same joy. It is not for the Brahmin caste in the world of letters that he writes, but for the minds and hearts of people everywhere. And, finally, the quality which he most seeks in life and in literature, which he praises most when found and laments most when it is absent, which he most constantly strives to impart and to make known through his own writings, is the spiritual quality—"the divine idea of the world."

THE TRAGEDY OF THE PONTIFICATE OF PIUS X

HENRY C. SHELDON

West Newton, Mass.

THIS tragedy can be affirmed in a threefold sense. It can be given, in the first place, a distinct association with the Pontiff; in the second place, with the fortune of the company of eminent Roman Catholic scholars that the Pontiff sought to suppress; in the third place, with the probable effect of his decisions and measures upon the future interests of the papal church. It is our purpose to consider the tragedy in each of these senses.

I

Giuseppe Melchior Santo, who had been Bishop of Mantua and Patriarch of Venice, crossed the line of a very fateful responsibility when, in 1903, he became Pope Pius X. The movement which has come to be known as Modernism, and which aimed to bring Roman Catholicism into more harmonious relations with modern science, recent philosophy, and the demands of historical research, was then in full flush. To the new pope, who was as remote as any ecclesiastic could be from admitting that the traditional and established system needed any emendation or revised interpretation, the Modernist movement seemed nothing better than a nefarious assault upon the church and even upon religion itself. He resolved to thrust it down with unsparing severity. The document which represents his major stroke, the encyclical *Pascendi dominici gregis*, issued September 7, 1907, may be said to well-nigh exhaust the vocabulary of denunciation. He charges the Modernists with being, in their philosophical alignments, patrons of agnosticism and disseminators of views closely affiliating with pantheism. "They lay the axe to the faith in its deepest fibers, and diffuse poison through the whole tree. . . . There is no part of Catholic faith that they do not strive to corrupt. . . . None is more astute than they in the employment of a thousand

noxious devices. . . . As audacity is their chief characteristic, there is no conclusion of any kind from which they shrink or which they do not thrust forward with pertinacity and assurance. . . . They go on their way, reprimands and condemnations notwithstanding, masking an incredible audacity under a mock semblance of humility. . . . It is a fixed and established principle with them that both science and history must be atheistic. . . . The methods and doctrines of Modernist apologetics are replete with errors, made not for edification but for destruction, not for the making of Catholics but for the seduction of those who are Catholics into heresy, and tending to the utter subversion of all religion. . . . With our eyes fixed upon the whole system no one will be surprised that we define Modernism to be the synthesis of all heresies. . . . It means the destruction, not of the Catholic religion alone, but of all religion. . . . By many roads Modernism leads to atheism and to the annihilation of all religion. The error of Protestantism made the first step on the path; that of Modernism makes the second; atheism makes the next. . . . The Modernists seize upon the professorships in the seminaries and universities, and gradually make of them chairs of pestilence.¹ . . . This hotbed of error and perdition continues to be a grave and deep evil.² . . . What they propose is a universal apostasy from the faith and discipline of the church.³ . . . While the turbulent innovators of other times, as a rule, retained some fragment of the treasure of revealed doctrine, the Moderns would seem to have no peace until they have utterly destroyed it."⁴

The measures ordered in the encyclical *Pascendi* to be put in force against Modernism were in line with the chain of unrestrained denunciations. They have been fairly summarized in the following statement: "All the young professors suspected of Modernism are to be driven from their chairs in the seminaries. Infected books are to be condemned indiscriminately, even though they may have received an *imprimatur*. A committee of safe censors for the revision of books is to be established in every diocese.

¹ The above citations are from the encyclical *Pascendi*.

² *Encyc. Communism Rerum*, 1909.

³ *Encyc. on Borromeo*, 1910.

⁴ *Ibid.*

Meetings of modernizing priests and laymen are to be forbidden. Young ecclesiastics who seem anxious to follow the movement of contemporary thought are to be prevented from so doing. Every diocese is to have a vigilance committee to discover and delete Modernists. Finally, the bishops are to inform the Holy See periodically on the condition of their respective dioceses in regard to the spread of Modernist ideas."⁵ Later the following drastic prescription was added to the above: "To remove all suspicion of the secret introduction of Modernism, we ordain that the individual professors, before inaugurating their lectures at the beginning of the year, shall present to the bishop the text they propose to use in teaching or the questions or theses which are to be treated; then that the teaching of each of them may be examined during the year, and should it appear that this is not in harmony with sound doctrine, the fact shall be held sufficient to have the professor removed there and then." Further, as the papal decree goes on to state, each professor—together with a full list of other officials—must take oath to accept each and every definition of the unerring teaching of the church and profess submission to all the condemnations, declarations, and directions contained in the encyclical letter *Pascendi*.⁶

In the full list of his fierce denunciations of the Modernists and in the unsparing measures issued for their total suppression Pius X certainly made an extraordinary record. Clement VI may have given a more notable specimen of an envenomed vocabulary in his bull against the German emperor, Louis of Bavaria. One and another pope, who was favored with a congenial instrument in a contemporary secular ruler, may have had in hand a more effective means of bringing down opponents to the status of the ash heap. But certainly no pontiff in recent centuries has appreciably surpassed in attacks upon any party the ruthlessness of the onslaught of Pius X against the Modernists.

Herein lay, in a conspicuous degree, the tragedy of his pontificate. Not that the pope suffered greatly in his own feeling from what he deemed the necessity of being severe. He seems

⁵ The Programme of Modernism prepared by Italian Modernists in answer to the encyclical *Pascendi*.

⁶ *Motu Proprio*, September 1, 1910.

indeed to have earned, in advance of his election to the papal throne, a reputation for kindness and amiability. But it is easy to surmise that any element of personal distress involved in the exercise of severity was more than counterbalanced by his conviction of acting as God's viceregent for the overthrow of the enemies of the true church and the true religion. In the days of Leo XIII he had hailed him as "the guardian of the Holy Scriptures, the interpreter of the doctrine of Jesus Christ, the supreme dispenser of the treasures of the church, the head of the Catholic religion, the chief shepherd of souls, the infallible teacher, the secure guide, who directs us on our way through a world wrapped in darkness and the shadow of death. All the strength of the church is in the pope. All the foundations of our faith are based in the successor of Peter."⁷ Perhaps Pius X would not have cared to apply to himself the precise terms of this description, still there is no doubt that he claimed for himself very much of what he assigned to his predecessor. In one of his encyclicals he speaks of the "great reward which shines out for all those who obey Christ in his vicar, in all that concerns the guidance of souls, or the government of the church, or that in any way is connected with these objects."⁸

As related, then, to Pius X, we construe the tragedy involved in this phase of his pontificate more in an objective than in a subjective sense. It consists in the adverse verdict which he earned for himself from impartial historical criticism by the style of his crusade against the Modernists.

II

To justify an adverse judgment on the administration of Pius X by no means implies that the Modernists were above challenge in their teachings. They might have been seriously at fault without giving proper occasion for the frantic charges against them solemnly published by the pope, or for his attempt to quell them by a free use of the pontifical bludgeon. In fact, as will appear shortly, there were elements in the theoretical

⁷ Cited by F. A. Forbes, *Life of Pius X*, p. 41.

⁸ *Encyc. Communium Rerum*, April 21, 1921.

scheme of some of their most prominent representatives which call for criticism and refutation.

Modernism proper, as a development inside of Roman Catholicism, made its appearance somewhat abruptly. It was very little in evidence before the last decade of the nineteenth century. A ground for it, however, was laid somewhat earlier. Among the causes working in its direction was the impact of modern philosophies as opposed to the scholastic Aristotelianism, the prominence gained by the newer type of biblical criticism, and the growing prevalence of the idea of evolution. In addition to these sources of impulsion considerable account is made by some historians of what has been termed "Americanism." But this strikes us as being of minor importance. Its leading advocates, such as Isaac Thomas Hecker, founder of the Paulist brotherhood, and Archbishop Ireland, had no ambition to modify the current interpretation of the Roman Catholic system in general. They simply contended that it was expedient to take some account in church administration of national peculiarities, to place a larger stress upon the active virtues as compared with the passive, and to extend somewhat the scope of lay influence in the ecclesiastical sphere. Modernists were quite accessible to these points of view; however, they went much further under the influence of the three causes mentioned above. Just how far modern philosophy was a modifying factor in their thinking may stand in question, but it may at least be credited with affecting somewhat their view of the scope of cognition proper and with inclining them to a definite emphasis upon the divine immanence. As respects the newer type of biblical criticism there is ample evidence that it influenced them greatly. Roman Catholic scholars in good repute were accepting to a greater or less extent the revised conception of the authorship of the Pentateuch. So Von Hügel, Lagrange, Bickell, Van Hoonacker, Robert Clarke, Van den Biesen, Von Hummelauer, Charles Robert, William Berry, and F. E. Gigot. None of these were radicals; but the shackles of tradition being once loosened in relation to the field of biblical inquiry, there was opportunity, as was shown in the case of Loisy, to make startling advances. From the side of evolution theory a vital impulse was also im-

parted. The vogue given to that theory in the field of natural science was not unnaturally carried over, to some extent, by minds which felt the burden of the traditional system, to the domain of theology. This transference was the more readily accomplished in view of the fact that the great English convert, John Henry Newman, had already given a rather conspicuous application of the idea of evolution to the sphere of church doctrine.

Of the pronounced exponents of Modernism the larger proportion was furnished by France and Italy. Prominent among the representatives of the former country were Loisy, Laberthonnière, and Le Roy. In the Italian group stood Minnichi and Fracassini, and the Modernist interest was fostered for a time among their countrymen by several periodicals, such as the *Rinnovamento* and the *Nova et Vetera*. In the German domain affiliation with Modernism has been placed to the account of Professor Erhard of Strassburg and Professor Schnitzer of Munich. But for the most part German Catholicism has given rather scanty manifestation of the presence and action of the Modernist leaven. Considerable stir was indeed made by the liberal Catholicism of Hermann Schell, but this did not amount to downright Modernism, being in fact little more than an equivalent for "Americanism." George Tyrrell was an eminent representative in England; few, however, were associated with him in that country. The United States, so far as we have discovered, produced in the open no full-fledged exponent.

In naming the views of Modernists respect must be paid to diversities in their thinking. Most of them subscribed to the following points: (1) The legitimacy of according considerable scope to the idea of doctrinal evolution. (2) The propriety of emphasizing the thought of the divine immanence and of conceiving of the process of revelation in harmony with this thought; in other words, they accentuated the inward working of God upon man's heart and conscience, as a means of illumination, rather than his communication of a message by any form of external agency. (3) The necessity, in deference to the results of recent biblical criticism, of adopting a less technical view of the Bible than has prevailed in past times. (4) The assigning still large

importance to the solidarity of the church as opposed to the individualism characteristic of Protestantism.

For acquaintance with Modernism of a very pronounced type one can conveniently turn to the writings of Loisy, Tyrrell, and the manifesto put forth by the Italian group under the title "The Programme of Modernism." The treatises given to the public by Loisy deal extensively with New Testament criticism. His retrenchment from the historical character of the Gospels is very broad—quite as broad, it strikes us, as that made by either Strauss or Renan. In order to gain an appearance of conserving any real authority to the dogmatic system of his church he is obliged to make large account of the progressive working of the Divine Agent in Christian believers. Nor does he succeed in so manipulating this point of view that he presents any credible basis for doctrinal construction. He assumes a preponderant cast of relativity in all theological formulas. They simply are adapted to serve a practical purpose as forms of expression accommodated to special eras. In any continuous use they must be treated as symbols. Thus only can they be harmonized with the perpetual demands of evolution. Tyrrell retains, as a matter of fact, a larger historical basis in the Gospels than does Loisy. Still, at least occasionally, he carries the idea of symbolism in doctrinal statements to great length. "The Modernist," he says, "will not allow even theology to be tied to any revealed and stereotyped statements, but only to religious experiences of which certain statements are the spontaneous, self-chosen, but at most symbolic expressions."⁹ As respects the Italian Modernists who issued the "Programme," they can be said to approximate pretty closely to the standpoints of Loisy and Tyrrell. The unmitigated antithesis which they postulate between science and religion, knowledge and faith, tends to eliminate the objective or historical basis of revelation and to cancel the possibility of any formulations of doctrine which are entitled to endure.

Undoubtedly the authors just reviewed gave forth many statements well suited to earn the hearty appreciation of an intelligent Protestant. We are obliged, however, to conclude that they compromised their cause by the extreme to which they carried

⁹ *Medievalism*, p. 152.

some of their points of view. A broader and more judicial spirit would have advised, not indeed to make small account of biblical criticism, but to be on guard against underrating the historic basis of Christianity, and against sacrificing it to a negative dogmatism which unjustifiably claims the name and the merits of historical criticism. A kindred failure to observe the just proportion belongs to the Modernist position relative to the symbolical character of Christian doctrines. That symbolism has a place here is not to be denied. In the deeper ranges of religious truth there are things which we cannot bring to complete expression, and our best attempts to formulate them must result in statements which have more or less of the character of adumbrations or symbols. But it is quite possible to push the supposition of symbolism so far as to land in unmitigated agnosticism, and to leave only sentimental grounds for preferring any definite forms of doctrinal statement. Now we do not charge the Modernists, even those of the radical wing, with a formal intention to proceed to this extreme. We cannot overlook the fact, however, that one and another of them have given expression to very broad propositions on the symbolical nature of Christian doctrines, and that as a party they have not been duly careful to call attention to necessary qualifications on the notion of doctrinal flux.

The Modernists, in the main, were imbued with an earnest religious interest. Moreover, they entertained a genuine attachment to the Roman Catholic Church, and conceived that they were working to safeguard that church against injurious collision with the results of modern science, biblical criticism, and historical research. To be charged, therefore, in the face of the public, with being conscienceless marauders in the sphere of sacred things, with striving to destroy the church and to extirpate religion itself, was painful to them beyond measure. It was a bitter tragedy to which they were subjected. To a man of emotional wealth, like Tyrrell, the ordeal which finally included specific personal censure, was specially distressing. Whether he would have found it possible, under the conditions, to have conserved much longer his hope for Roman Catholicism was not to appear, since death overtook him in 1909. To Loisy (who was excommunicated in 1908) a

longer period was given to revise his judgment on the church which so sternly rebuked him. In a book published in 1919 he speaks of Catholicism as representing an outlawed system, a type of ecclesiasticism which shuts out the possibility of free research and of the wholesome exercise of personal intelligence.¹⁰ In his autobiography ("My Duel with the Vatican") recently translated into English, he indulges in some very disparaging sentences in relation to traditional Romanism. Here too he acknowledges (pp. 99, 186) that the radical scheme of relativity and symbolism which he once advocated is well suited to vapor away the whole system of doctrine.

III

It remains to notice the third sense in which the pontificate of Pius X was marked by serious tragedy. This can be defined in brief as the contribution rendered thereby to the enchainment of Roman Catholicism to a system which, under the exercise of reason and free inquiry, must become more and more intolerable. The contribution of Pius X to this baneful result, it must be conceded, was not greater than that of his immediate predecessors, Pius IX and Leo XIII. In point of theory, or dogmatic specifications, it was less, very distinctly less than that which came through Pius IX. Its significance lies in the way in which he repeated the most ultra points in the teaching of the two preceding popes and in the unsparing measures which were added to make these ultra points of teaching regnant in the church. To illustrate this topic we shall need to recall some of the pronouncements and measures of Pius IX and Leo XIII.

As the Vatican Council of 1869-70 was scarcely more than an instrument of Pius IX for giving expression to his dogmatic preferences, we may take any of its decisions as manifestives of that pontiff. Four of these decisions bearing on the subject of authority are pertinent to the present connection. The first declares that the meaning attached by the church to its dogmas is never to be departed from, thus shutting out any approach to the Modernist principle of a reinterpretation of the Catholic creeds.

¹⁰ *De la Discipline Intellectuelle*, pp. 96-107.

The second decision affirms that when the Roman pontiff speaks *ex cathedra*, or in his proper official character, on questions of faith and morals, his utterances are infallible and irreformable of themselves, and not from the consent of the church. The third Vatican decision asserts the unqualified governing supremacy of the Pope—a declaration of immense importance, since it obligates to practical acquiescence in papal mandates whether they are given forth in the precise form which entitles them to be counted infallible or not. The fourth decision was obviously designed to affirm the strict inerrancy of the Bible. It asserts that the books which the church holds to be sacred and canonical contain revelation without admixture of error, having been written by the inspiration of the Holy Ghost and having God for their author.

Pius IX, as represented by the decrees of the Vatican Council, was unqualifiedly followed by Leo XIII. The latter, who was a much broader and more learned man than his predecessor or successor, makes the instructions of the Roman pontiff the indisputable standard both of belief and conduct. "As a union of minds," he says, "requires perfect agreement in one faith, so it requires that wills be entirely subject and obedient to the church and to the Roman pontiff as to God. . . . Both that which ought to be believed and that which ought to be done the church by divine right teaches, and in the church the supreme pontiff."¹¹ Again, he speaks of the pope "as being for all Catholics the master of their faith and the ruler of their consciences."¹² Still further, in message after message, he commends the doctrinal authority of Thomas Aquinas, and obviously finds a reason for so doing, not merely in the general consideration that his teaching was a bulwark to the papal system, but in the specific fact that he "sacredly revered the Roman pontiff, and held that to be subject to him is altogether necessary to salvation." Once more Leo XIII declared in the most unequivocal terms for the absolute inerrancy of the Bible.¹³

Pius X was less affluent than the two pontiffs preceding him in utterances on the subject of the authority which is set over

¹¹ *Encyc. de Principis Civium Christianorum Officiis*, January 10, 1890.

¹² *Epist. ad Cardinal. Nina*, August 27, 1878.

¹³ *Encyc. Providentissimus Deus*, November 18, 1893.

Christians. But he made it perfectly evident that he was ready to champion the pontifical absoluteness which they asserted. He took pains to declare that no one can, without grave sin, dispute the decisions of the Biblical Commission, published with the pope's approval. He cites in the encyclical *Pascendi* the Vatican requisition for the attachment of an unchanging sense to dogmas once proclaimed by the church. He quotes Pius IX on the duty of philosophy not to prescribe what is to be believed, but to embrace what is to be believed with reasonable obedience. Very emphatically he accentuated the hierarchical conception of church government, repudiating as a piece of Modernist folly the notion that any share in the direction of the church should be granted to the lower clergy and the laity.¹⁴ Through the Inquisition he stamped as false the assumption that divine inspiration is not so extended to the whole of Sacred Scripture as to render each and every part immune from all error.¹⁵

On the relation of church and state and the scope of papal authority within the sphere of the state, the three pontiffs held essentially the same maxims. All three condemned the separation of church and state, and so rendered a judgment adverse to the arrangement which obtains in this country. In several instances Pius IX took upon himself to declare null and void state laws which he regarded as objectionable. Leo XIII was more prudent about coming into open collision with secular powers than either his predecessor or successor; but in journal assertion of the reach of pontifical sovereignty he was not a whit behind them. "It belongs to the pontiff," he wrote, "not only to rule the church, but in general so to order the actions of Christian citizens that they may be in suitable accord with the hope of obtaining eternal salvation."¹⁶ Pius X, in at least one conspicuous instance, took up the rôle of nullifying state law. Referring to features in the recently adopted republican constitution of Portugal, he declared: "We of our apostolic authority reprobate, condemn, and reject the law separating church and state in Portugal. . . . We proclaim and announce that whatsoever it contains contrary to the

¹⁴ Encyc. *Pascendi*.

¹⁵ *Syllabus of errors*, No. 11.

¹⁶ Encyc. *Sapientiae Christianae*, January 10, 1890.

inalienable rights of the church is null and void and to be so held."¹⁷ Furthermore, Pius X paid very scanty deference to the provisions of state law when, in 1908, he notified Roman Catholics generally that only marriages solemnized by a Catholic priest, where one or both of the contracting parties are Catholics, were to be regarded as having any validity. A similar comment applies to his decree (October 9, 1911) forbidding, under pain of excommunication, that Catholics should bring suit against members of the clergy and compel them to appear before lay judges. A decree of this kind is contradictory to that equality in citizenship which is supposed to be an obligatory ideal of the modern state.

So every element of high ecclesiasticism which had been set forward in the preceding half century was reaffirmed and given new illustration in the pontificate of Pius X. What kind of an inheritance is this for a church enrolling so many millions as are placed under Roman Catholic authority? Does it make anything less than a serious tragedy?

Consider for a moment the case of Roman Catholic scholars. What can they accomplish in the field of biblical criticism under the shackles of a dogmatic system which affirms the absolute inerrancy of the Bible? Does any thoughtful and well-informed person suppose that the scientific mind can be made to believe in the possible reconciliation of Genesis with geology, or to accept as historic fact the enormous periods assigned to the lives of the antediluvian patriarchs, or to acknowledge that the actions assigned to God in some parts of the Old Testament can be made to agree with the ideal of the divine character set forth in the New Testament? To be tied to the theory of complete inerrancy when it means to be tied to a self-contradictory standard and to the denial of well-authenticated facts is certainly to be given no comfortable refuge. What a relief it would be to Roman Catholic scholars could they be permitted to lay the stress upon the trend and outcome of the biblical revelation, instead of being condemned to accept the inerrancy of all particular representations in the sacred canon!

Note further the impasse which Roman Catholic scholars

¹⁷ *Encyc. Jandudum*, May 24, 1911.

must encounter in the close examination of ecclesiastical history. It is enough to drive to madness a competent investigator to be required to maintain the apostolic origin of the papal constitution of the church, and to conserve a fragment of credibility to the dogma of papal infallibility. Why indeed should the scholar trouble himself to make thorough and candid research when the certain fate of the published results would be a consignment to the Index of Prohibited Writings, as appears in the case of the worthy volumes of Duchesne on the History of the Ancient Church?

Reference was made to the status assigned to the laity in the manifestoes of Pius X. If we are to judge from recent instances, a considerable proportion of Roman Catholic laymen is capable of ignoring pontifical attempts at dictation within the civil sphere. But how about being rated as the merest cipher in ecclesiastical matters? Is it probable that they will continue to acquiesce in this disparaging arrangement for an indefinite period? Will no demand arise that they be granted a voice in determining when a parochial school shall be started in a given neighborhood, and in settling many other questions in which they have a vital interest? We will not venture to predict any positive movement for a change of status, but it is difficult to imagine that a great body of men, amid the currents of the modern world, will perpetually consent to be treated as incompetent minors.

The drastic measures against the Modernists banished for the time being all open attempts to modify the traditional Roman Catholic system. It is possible that the peace and quiet thus secured may endure for quite a long period; but that result can be achieved only at the price of a passivity, a servility before the demands of arbitrary authority, which is incompatible with the higher type of religious manhood. Doubtless many who take the passive attitude are likely to exhibit very beautiful fruits of piety. But passivity cannot continually be cultivated throughout a wide-reaching constituency without involving a very serious forfeiture of moral and religious values. Then, too, the extreme on this side is sadly liable sooner or later to give place to reactions toward irreligious license.

HILDEBRAND—BUILDER OF THE PAPACY¹

ARTHUR WILFORD NAGLER

Evanston, Ill.

IN the year that Roman Catholicism celebrates her Jubilee it is well to make inquiry as to her most distinctive institution. The anachronism of an institution essentially mediæval thriving in an atmosphere that we call modern is quite apparent. Perhaps we are not so modern as we think we are. Perhaps we should not be so modern as we think we should be. It is a fact that mediævalism has lived on right through the Reformation down to the present day. But is that altogether to be deplored? Is not some of it at least of permanent validity? The mediæval ideal of social solidarity, its conception of state and empire subject to the moral law of God, its romanticism and its mysticism, may teach our highly individualized, materialized, scientific civilization something of value.

Must we include in this category of desirable elements the papal institution? Even if that were denied it, could it be shown that for a long period it served a high and noble mission, its chief architect and exponent would have a secure place among the immortals. It has been said that before the Renaissance everything reflected the spirit of Hildebrand, after that time, everything pointed toward Luther. Hildebrand and Luther, titanic, creative, architectonic, two master builders of history! Even now the conflict rages between the ideals for which they stood. We might as well admit that the aftermath of the Great War has brought new splendor to Hildebrand's fame at the same time that it has tarnished that of Luther. Witness the statement that ecclesiastically speaking Rome won the war.

This year all roads in the Catholic world are leading to the Eternal City. Mussolini's White Terror may deter some of the faithful from making the holy pilgrimage but will not cool the

¹The chief source material for Hildebrand's life is found in a work entitled "Monumenta Gregoriana" (in *Bibliotheca Rerum Germanicarum*) ed. by P. Jaffe. References in this treatise are indicated—Jaffe. Another good source of a more general nature is Mirbt's "Quellen zur Geschichte des Papsttums u. d. des Römischen Katholizismus."

ardor of those actually attending. And the inevitable question, like Banquo's ghost, will appear to haunt the imagination of these pilgrims. Why must his Holy Father, the Vicar of Christ, be shut up like a captive within the confines of the Vatican grounds? Why has he been stripped of temporal power? That power, it is alleged, is essential to the pope's spiritual effectiveness. All manner of suggestions have been offered with the intent of giving him full sovereignty without infringing upon that of the Italian government. The amount of territory seems to be a negligible matter so long as the pope's right to temporal sovereignty is acknowledged. One enthusiast suggested a square centimeter of land—to begin with. Others would include the Leonine city; still others the little hill upon which the Methodist college now stands. To establish a *modus operandi* satisfactory to both the Curia and the Italian government is a task demanding the most astute diplomacy. It seems that this problem will be with us for a long time to come because the papal institution has the vitality of the proverbial cat. Its roots go back into the distant past, indeed, to the time of Christ, if we accept the evidence presented by Catholic historians. But its origin at a comparatively late date and its gradual rise to power and primacy from definite historic causes can be better attested.

In the very beginning of our era we are confronted with a religious community in which the distinction between clergy and laity seems not to have obtained. A little later the clergy, as yet without a specific sacred character, becomes separated as a professional class from the laity. The bishops rise to greater authority by the second century, and during the next two centuries a definite number of these assume chief rank in the church. Among these patriarchs Rome eventually exalts herself to a position of primacy, hotly contested, it is true, by her Eastern rivals. In more than one respect her position was unique. She was the only apostolic foundation in the West with a free hand in the region which was destined to become the chief arena of events. The other patriarchs were forced to be satisfied with lesser spheres of influence in the East. The political position of Rome was strategic and the bishop of the western metropolis inherited that

advantage. This advantage was augmented by the transfer of the capital to the East. When the Mohammedans later captured one Eastern patriarchate after the other, they unwittingly played into the hands of Rome. Moreover, her bishops gained fame and prestige by a series of shrewd, compromising, moderate and practical decisions, as distinguished from the more extreme positions often held by her rivals. Imperial Rome fell but left as a heritage a genius for government which was marvelously utilized by the imperial Western church in civilizing, unifying, and evangelizing the barbarian hordes. And, finally, the theory of the Petrine supremacy in an age when "the dish of fancy was apt to run away with the spoon of fact" served as a substantial basis upon which to build the most absurd pretensions. Although we may regard this as a supernatural argument, and hence outside the confines of legitimate history, the fact must not be overlooked that the belief in that theory was of tremendous historical import. It crops out again and again in the utterances of the great popes, in the intrepid Leo I, virtually the ruler of the West, in Gregory I, the founder of the mediæval papacy, in Nicholas I, called the Pseudo-Isidorian Decretals, in Sylvester II, the most learned man of his age.

Before Hildebrand's time the church was possessed with considerable temporal authority through the acquisition of vast tracts of land and the extension of her feudal power. She was also strong in moral authority because all Western Christians were compelled to obey her commands or suffer the consequences of the terrible anathema. Strength based upon unity was with her rather than with the secular powers. Fables and tales at which we now smile exerted great influence upon the Middle Ages and helped to direct the course of history. These also were at the command of Rome, to cite only the Donation of Constantine, and the False Decretals.

The real temporal authority of the papacy, however, is based upon a historic fact, the Donation of Pepin the Short, later sanctioned by the illustrious Charlemagne. The crowning of the latter by a grateful pope in the year 800 was one of those seemingly insignificant events, innocent enough in itself, but charged

with political dynamite. It led to the question—Who is to rule the West, the successor of Saint Peter or the successor of Charlemagne and Otto I? The attempt to answer that question covered several centuries and received its mightiest impulse from the ecclesiopolitical theories propounded by Hildebrand.

The period of the so-called Hildebrandine popes (1048-1073) revealed increasingly the power behind the throne, the diminutive monk who represented in his person the deepest undercurrents of the time and the highest expression of the Cluny reform movement. His spirit was early shown in his refusal to go to Rome with his friend, the newly elected Leo IX, because the latter had been instituted by imperial authority and not according to ecclesiastical regulations. Probably as early as this his fertile mind was beginning to evolve that plan which must be called a stroke of genius, the establishment of the College of Cardinals. After Leo's death Hildebrand became the director of papal policies and the Mark Hanna of papal elections, at one time with masterful diplomacy bringing about the downfall of a pope who had been elevated during the papal secretary's absence from Rome. And to his farsighted statesmanship must be ascribed the alliance with the Normans which easily made the papal prince the dominating factor in the peninsula. The electoral mechanism, likewise, working automatically and independently of outside control, tended to make the papal office less and less a play-ball in the hands of local and foreign political factions.

After the ground work had been prepared and when the psychological moment arrived, the man of destiny, with tears in his eyes, ascended the papal throne. In a heart-revealing moment he relates that he yielded reluctantly when the Roman people demanded his election. A man of his serious bent of mind, incorruptible and Puritanical, undoubtedly felt the awful responsibility resting upon his shoulders. Was not the welfare of the human race in his keeping? In the chronicle of Ekkehard of Aurach we read that Gregory assumed the papacy without the king's permission, having seized the exalted office with his own hand. The claim of Lambert of Aschaffenburg, on the contrary, that Hildebrand was unwilling to be consecrated without the

king's consent, must be set aside as inherently improbable in view of the apparent ignorance of the pope's opponents of such action. A fact that weighs heavily in his favor was that he remained elected and gave proof abundant that he was the man of the hour.

Immediately taking up the loose strands of the old Cluniac revival, he galvanized it into a living force of great potency. Hierarchical expediency was his point of departure—papal absolutism his goal. The general reformation of the church, very sadly needed, was attempted by two means, the prohibition of clerical marriage and a vigorous campaign against ecclesiastical graft known as simony. This constituted his first onslaught upon corruption. The second had the same end in view despite its political nature. It was an attempt to free the church entirely from state control and led to the bitter lay-investiture conflict. The last phase of his program involved nothing less than the dictatorship of the papacy in the secular affairs of the nations.

As to the first of these problems Gregory set out to accomplish what the legislation of earlier centuries had failed to do. He felt that he could not permit free marriage of the clergy when such action in a feudalized church threatened the alienation of church property. In addition he would in time face an unruly priestly caste system with the families of the clergy brought increasingly under state control. And in an age when the monastic ideal represented the religious life *par excellence* it would have been suicidal to have allowed priests to marry. An unmarried clergy, on the other hand, was not only more serviceable to the pope but also more closely bound up to him as a result of the severing of all worldly ties. Inasmuch as the monks had been the mainstay of the papacy, Gregory saw no reason why a celibate secular priesthood, dead to the world and those interests engendered by family life, might not become as strong a vanguard for the extension of papal power. They were to become soldiers of a spiritual army, and to the austere pope "spiritual" meant that they were not to be fathers, husbands, and citizens like everyone else, but citizens of the "civitas Dei," bound by ties of absolute military obedience to their spiritual commander.

To prevent the formation of a close and hereditary priestly

class which would seriously have threatened his theory of despotism, Gregory brought all delinquent cases under the category of concubinage. That a pope should deliberately plan forcibly to tear away from the priests their lawful wives and children seems to us the height of cruelty. But to him the breaking up of certain families was a minor consideration in comparison with the eternal interests of the church. It is quite needless to state that fierce and prolonged opposition met the pope's drastic decree. But with the aid of fanatical and zealous groups, such as the Pataria of Lombardy, and supported by a *Zeitgeist* that still harbored thoughts about the superiority of the celibate life, Gregory was able to win marked success in Italy and Germany, though at this time little was accomplished in France and still less in England. In the latter country, papal emissaries were openly insulted and one even burnt at the stake as a heretic. But time and tradition decreed differently. The Council of Trent placed the laurel wreath of victory upon the brow of Hildebrand in its momentous decision that clerical celibacy was binding upon the church for all time.

The church's physician diagnosed correctly the cancerous growth that was threatening the heart religion of the time, for the whole ecclesiastical structure was honeycombed with graft. Spiritual offices and honors were openly and unblushingly bought and sold. The higher prelates reimbursed themselves after the purchase of office by selling out the minor offices. The papal office itself did not escape the taint, for Gregory VI acquired the lucrative position by the payment of a large sum of gold to the incumbent, Benedict IX; and when Hildebrand saw that secular princes sold out the ecclesiastical foundations which were under their jurisdiction, he felt that it was about time to enforce the regulations in the "*corpus juris canonici*," for every act that bound a prelate to a secular overlord to that extent alienated him from the papacy. Thus, in his usual thorough and drastic manner, through synodical acts and papal decrees, he condemned those "who bought and sold the gift of the Holy Ghost," not even sparing offenders of high rank. Great breaches were made in the walls of the solidified evil, the pope going so far as to proclaim invalid sacraments

performed by simonist prelates, an action which was an echo of the old Donatist contention.

After Gregory had gained his spiritual soldiers in his warfare against simony and for celibacy, he planned to separate the offices of these soldiers from all vitiating influences which the lay world might exert upon them. Hence, away with the subjection of the clergy to secular power! One cure for the disease might have been the surrender of all church lands held in fief. But that would have made matters worse, for a poor church would have become still more dependent upon the state.

In characteristic fashion he met the issue squarely by prohibiting lay-investiture outright. No ecclesiastical position was to be granted by a layman or received by a clerical. A violation of this law brought excommunication upon the former, deposition upon the latter. In order to justify his action the pope asserted that in the ceremony of the feudal troth it was not meet that the hands which administered the sacraments be laid in the bloody hands of laymen. Moreover, all land which a bishop or an abbot owned by virtue of his office belonged to the church, not to the state. These principles were revolutionary because former popes had sanctioned the practice of lay-investiture. It was, in fact, a part of the law of the land. But the law of the church (God) was superior, and in case of conflict it had the right of way. Applying this principle Gregory sought to remove the property and privileges of each see and abbey from the feudal supervision of lay princes and transfer them to the jurisdiction of the pope. So far as the secular foundations were concerned the pope would have become the supreme overlord of all the property of the church. The complete application of this theory not only would have made him the most powerful sovereign in Europe but would have made the secular governments almost impossible. There would have been a state within a state in each nation, a condition that no self-respecting government could have tolerated. As it was, despite excommunications and depositions, Gregory moved very slowly toward his objective.

We are now in a position to analyze and appraise his ideal of universal theocracy. The church had been on the highroad to

secular power long before the eleventh century but Gregory more than his predecessors concentrated that ever expanding power in the papacy. This power from its strategic center was developed in two directions, inwardly throughout the organism of the church, and outwardly over all the governments. The first involved chiefly the ecclesiastical reforms to which allusion has been made. The second remains to be considered.

We shall fail to understand this phase of the life and aim of Gregory unless we transplant ourselves into the peculiar atmosphere of the Middle Ages. Everyone believed that the church was the only saving institution. Cyprian's "*extra ecclesia nulla salus*" (outside the church no salvation) was common property and Augustine's conception of the City of God was a glorious realization before men's eyes. The pope declared and many believed that the new Rome was destined to rule the world, not by worldly might but by the power of religion. It was acknowledged everywhere that the power of the church extended into the infinite, and no one could rationally object to the logical conclusion that in that case it must be supreme over all the finite beings on this earth. But the papacy was merely another name for the church; indeed, it was the church in essence. Consequently, it devolved upon that institution to administer the moral and spiritual affairs of the world.

Since the church was all-inclusive, the pope as Christ's special vicar upon earth could hardly be regarded as less than the head of both temporal and spiritual spheres. Since the church was the only channel through which the divine power worked for the salvation of mankind she must necessarily be superior to the secular powers. Moreover, the Lord had given Saint Peter and his successors power over all the kingdoms of the world. The only true church was that centered in Rome; the Eastern church, like the prodigal son, was outside the fold, "*instinctu diaboli*." When Gregory referred to the head of the church he made a distinction between the person of the pope and his official character. Of himself he could do nothing, personally he was unworthy, "*indigni*"; but as Saint Peter's successor he was clothed with the power and authority of God's supreme agent upon earth. That an immoral, wicked pope at times occupied the papal chair was in

itself not half so worthy of condemnation as for any Christian to doubt that he was actually the successor of Peter, clad with all the prerogatives of the prince of the apostles himself.

That Gregory, living in this mental atmosphere, sought to establish a theocracy over the Christian world seems to the present writer well established on the basis of all the facts. It is only fair to state, however, that certain Catholic authorities take exception to this conclusion. Brueck, for instance, denies that the pope strove to erect a universal monarchy or theocracy. Let us glance at the facts.

A significant document, known as the "Dictatus Papæ," produced during this period, though generally not credited to Gregory, expresses his point of view. His writings reflect its spirit faithfully, almost duplicating its words. The chief statements (in *Mirot, Quellen*, p. 127) read as follows:

2. The Roman Pontiff alone is properly called universal.
9. All princes should kiss the pope's feet only.
12. He can depose emperors.
19. He is not to be judged by anyone.
22. The Roman Church has never erred, nor will ever err through all eternity.
27. The pope can absolve subjects from their allegiance to men who are wicked.

Moreover, although the pope usually claimed for himself only the rôle of priest, servant of the servants of God, he frequently subordinated this to the call of political statecraft, "at one time craftily yielding and overlooking, at another obstinately steadfast, at one time advisedly dilatory, at another rashly and extravagantly encroaching." Sometimes his political vision obscured his spiritual vision. It would be unjust, however, to ascribe to him merely a selfish desire for personal aggrandizement. This "Puritan breathing the atmosphere of Old Testament theocracy" was usually driven by a high sense of duty. Kingdom interests rather than his own were his chief inspiration. To restore peace, unity, and joy to mankind by forcing the church to submit to the papacy and the world to the church led him occasionally to employ war and discord in order to gain their opposites. The

root of all evils, he claimed, was the degradation and enslavement of the church by secular princes. Instead, the God-given privilege of dominion rightfully belonged to the church. How absurd for a prince to claim power over that person (priest) by whom he himself can be bound and loosed in earth and in heaven! Kings were in need of the humblest priest at the portals of death in order to get a right start for the future world. Who would be so foolish as to ask this aid of an earthly king? He cannot bind or loose, cannot rescue the soul from the devil through the sacrament of baptism, cannot make the body and the blood of our Lord. In a letter to Rudolf the pope closes with a pompous statement magnifying the papal power, stressing the fact that this authority could take away empires and all possessions of men and grant them to whomsoever it deemed best.

Before harsh criticism is passed upon the pope's attitude toward the mediæval state that institution must be more closely scrutinized. We have before us a vast conglomeration of diverse states and petty principalities continually in conflict, with few policies which implied that an orderly government could be maintained. Feudalism was only another name for war, and in the eleventh century it constituted the social and political order of Europe. A pope would naturally be led to the conclusion that if secular governments by mismanagement, oppression, and sin were going to destruction and leading the people along the same path, he not only had the right to interfere but it was his duty to protest in the name of a righteous God and institute measures for relief. At the last day he must render account of kings, princes, peasants and serfs. Therefore, was he not responsible for the good behavior of all? Over the commonwealth of nations and principalities the pope was to preside for the sake of peace and unity, and "thus," to conclude in the words of a Catholic historian, Hefele, "when all thrones of the earth should lean upon the Apostolic See, then, and then only, would justice, harmony, peace and unity reign throughout the world." Does not this incite us to cry, "Page the League of Nations!"

These facts, typical of a host of others that might be mentioned, seem to bear out the contention that Gregory's real aim

was the establishment of a theocracy whose ultimate was world-wide papal empire. That he failed to reach this goal, that some of his actions seemed to run counter to the aim just stated, does not invalidate it. It simply means that he was human and that his goal was unattainable. His imperial idea may be illustrated by the pyramid. The base represented the political and purely secular affairs of life. Above that, on a higher plane, rested the spiritual, including all the relations of the ecclesiastical system, and overtopping all, at the apex, the pope, the successor of Peter, virtually the God for this world.

The audacity of the weaponless monk appears all the more remarkable when we realize that he lived in a militaristic age. He was not unarmed, however. Those who stood in his path he overcame or quieted by means of censures of varying degrees of effectiveness. In his papal armory he stored gas bombs of excommunication and the death ray of the interdict, together with sugar plums of diplomacy and olive branches of compromise. Besides these moral and spiritual weapons the pope declared that the carnal sword was at his disposal. Contrary to pacifistic sentiments, he pleaded for the right of the priest to bear arms when occasions demanded it (Jaffe, p. 391), such as a war in behalf of the church, in defense of the poor and oppressed, in a holy crusade. It had been his ambition to lead in person a great crusade against the infidel Mohammedans.

The measure of his success depended also upon the amount of cooperation he could expect. Among his staunchest supporters was the influential monk Damiani, who believed that every infringement of the papal prerogative was a heresy; that even divine law was to be relegated to the background if the present interests of the church demanded it. The monks generally, and all those of an ascetic cast of mind, entered the lists to fight the battles of the pope. To these must be added those of a reform spirit, vitally interested in any campaign waged for the freedom of the church. Such a slogan caught the imagination of the people as slogans still do to-day. With the assistance of the Normans to the south and the German malcontents to the north, in addition to the influence wielded by the sympathetic Countess Matilda and the Em-

press Agnes, Gregory developed into an adversary not to be despised.

Thus, supported by theocratic theories and actively aided by certain lay and ecclesiastical leaders who sought to make capital out of the struggles of the age, Gregory was able to extend his authority over much of western Europe. His was the controlling influence in Italy despite the independent bearing of his vassals, the Normans. A number of lands which bordered upon the Mediterranean he regarded as fiefs, such as Dalmatia, Sardinia, and Corsica, while northern Africa felt the power of his might. Spain was held to be a special daughter of the Roman See, from the very beginning having been under the law of Peter. In a letter to Alfonso VI he refers to a legend as historic fact in which Paul and Peter are said to have sent seven bishops to Spain to supervise the instruction of the barbarians (Jaffe, p. 83).

France proved to be a different proposition, especially her king, Philip, called by Gregory "the worst of the tyrants that enslaved the church." The personal letters of the pope (Jaffe, pp. 114, 146, 313), in which he enumerates and describes the king's manifold sins, make interesting reading, but proved of no avail. The Archbishop of Rheims was deposed, the clergy of France threatened with ecclesiastical punishment, the terrible interdict held like a Damocles sword over the nation, but the Gallican spirit prevailed. The pope beat a strategic retreat.

With William the Conqueror Gregory employed a more conciliatory attitude, though at the start he tried to make the Norman king of England swear allegiance to the Holy See. In Scandinavia the Roman dictator was more successful because he discovered rulers in those lands less inclined to resent interference in domestic affairs. For a similar reason his success was marked in Poland, Bohemia, and other Slav countries. Hungary he regarded as a papal fief. On the whole he was friendly toward the Eastern patriarch, actively planning to go to the assistance of Constantinople when the Seljuk Turks threatened its safety. Other interests, however, turned his attention to a problem close at home. This, the most trying time of his life, was the prolonged struggle with Henry IV of Germany.

The claims of Gregory bore upon Germany with the greatest force because it seemed the best field in which to enforce his pretensions. After a series of preliminary skirmishes, Henry declared the pope deposed. The latter returned the compliment by hurling a bull of excommunication against the king. This act meant deposition because it automatically absolved the people of their oath of allegiance; an act, it must be granted, in perfect harmony with papal theory and with Scripture—as interpreted by the pope. On this point it is sufficient to quote one of Hildebrand's favorite passages, 1 Sam. 15. 23: "Rebellion is as the sin of witchcraft, and stubbornness is as idolatry; because thou hast rejected the word of the Lord, he has also rejected thee from being king." Against those who voiced their opposition to this high-handed act the pope furnished precedents (the deposition of the last of the Merovingians) and argued at length on the basis of Saint Peter's authority. At times it was necessary to enforce a higher law, the law of God, over against a mere human enactment. In extreme cases this might involve the abrogation of human oaths. If a ruler abused his power the pope had a right to call him to account and, if obdurate, to expel him from the fellowship of the church. In the Middle Ages that signified much more than the loss of membership in the church; it arbitrarily deprived a man of his civil rights and privileges.

Whatever judgment is passed upon the case, as a matter of fact the immediate results were extremely gratifying to the pope. The papal bull thundered through Germany and did not, as the Irish facetiously claimed was usually the case in their land, turn out to be a calf. According to one contemporary account, the whole world trembled. The royal party rapidly disintegrated, the opposition to the crown grew apace, and Henry was given one year in which to obtain papal absolution. In this interim Gregory was practically sovereign over the Holy Roman Empire. Had it not been for the reversal of fortune after Canossa, Henry's debacle might have remained complete. Realizing the advantage he had gained, the pope as politician hesitated three days, but as priest he was morally bound to give absolution to the royal penitent standing outside as a beggar in the cold. And the absolved

penitent made the most of the changed situation. He won one position after the other, forcing his implacable foe to fall back upon the last Hindenburg line of papal defense, Rome itself. Here the pope was saved from capture only by the appearance of his vassal, Guiscard, with his Normans. While Henry rejoiced in the bestowal of the imperial crown at the hands of his anti-pope, Clement III, Hildebrand, worn, exhausted but still defiant, died as an exile at Salerno in 1085. And yet the unconquerable spirit lived on. Napoleon sensed it when he said: "If I were not Napoleon I should like to have been Gregory VII."

As long as the papacy exhibits any measure of vitality, as long as Roman Catholicism exists, indeed, as long as men preserve an interest in historic facts, so long will the name of him be held in high respect, if not in honor, who combined in rare fashion the idealism of the dreamer with the practical energy of the man of affairs, who dared to undertake what others had deemed visionary, who revolutionized the whole theory of papal prerogative. In connection with the Jubilee of this year Rome is planning, so it is said, to canonize a number of saints. Among the six candidates listed we do not find the name of Hildebrand. Why not? Presumably because no miracle-working wonders can be traced to him or to his remains. But Rome can never forget that one of the chief reasons why she has cause for celebrating is to be found in the life-work of the man who fought her battles at a time of crisis—Hildebrand, defender of papal prerogative, virtual builder of the papal structure.

DONATISM

SAMUEL NOWELL STEVENS

Northwestern University

IN the history of the church there were many crises which deserve study and evaluation from the church historian. Some of these were brought about because of the desire of the Fathers to establish some particular theological concept as the fundamental ground for Christian faith, while others began in revolt against the established order or against certain tendencies in the church which appeared to those revolting as dangerous to the future of the organization. Out of the struggle and travail of these crises the church formulated for itself its creed, and established its conception of church polity and organization.

The great Donatist schism of the fourth century in Africa forms one of the most important chapters of early church history. It is important in itself, being the first great trouble that the church had to face after the peace of Constantine. It is also important as a test case of schism. It is the purest case of schism without heresy that can be found in church history. Augustine toward the end of the controversy repeatedly called the Donatists heretics and advocated serious measures against them, but the general feeling in the church, expressed by Augustine himself in the beginning of the schism, was "that we have the same Christ, the same mysteries, the same sacraments."

The Arian controversy gave the church an occasion to establish in her creed what she thought about the nature of Christ, the Trinity, and so forth. The Donatist controversy gave her the opportunity to define what she believed about herself. So truly is this the case, that the writings of the Fathers against the Donatists compose for all practical purposes a complete treatise *De Ecclesia*.

The great Diocletian persecution left a tragic legacy to the church in Africa. Herein is the source of the great schism to be found. One of the laws which were enforced during the perse-

cution was that all sacred books had to be handed over to the officials who were delegated to destroy them. This "handing over" of the books was considered a sign of apostasy and worse than heresy. It was not only a lack of true loyalty but it was a crime against the church. All of those who handed over the books and sacred vessels were called *Traditores* and of this group of people, quite a large number of both clergy and laity, we shall hear more later.

In the interest of adequate perspective it will be well for us to go back a few years before the schism actually started and observe the action of a group of bishops who met together in a little town, Cirta, in 305 A. D. A very stern, almost fanatical man was President of the Synod. They had important business to conduct. They had gathered to elect a new bishop for Cirta to fill the vacancy left by the death of the late incumbent. Secundus, for that was the leading official's name, opened the meeting by asking each one of the group whether or not he had been guilty of handing over the books during the persecution. A large number admitted that they had done so and one of those guilty accused Secundus of a like crime but he neither affirmed nor denied the accusation.

The election took place and one, Sylvanus, a confessed traditor, was ordained Bishop of Cirta. Not long after this event the Bishop of Tigsis (Secundus) received a friendly letter from Mensurius, the Bishop of Carthage, and Primate of all Africa. It seems that the purpose of the letter was to explain to the Numidian bishop the extent to which the Bishop of Carthage had indulged in handing over the sacred books. He says that the books handed over were only a few heretical writings which he had in his possession. More than this, the worthy prelate complains that certain Christians had such a passion for martyrdom that they went out of their way to antagonize the officials. These people claimed to possess sacred literature, then refused to surrender them to the official. They were cast into prison and, as Mensurius declares, "they lived sumptuously on the alms provided by admirers in the church and enjoyed the reputation of being heroes and martyrs." The good Bishop went on to say that he

had assigned to his Deacon Cecilian the task of putting a stop to this. He discouraged such useless fanaticism and denied the other members of the church the privilege of ministering to the ones in prison. This action started much trouble. The young Deacon enforced the Bishop's will rather rigorously and made enemies for both of them. This group of church members formed a party and openly opposed him. In 311 Mensurius died while on the way back from Rome.

The malcontents were led by a very angry and a very rich widow named Lucilla, who was bitterly opposed to the late Bishop and more antagonistic to the Deacon Cecilian, who refused to give her communion because of certain questionable practices with saints' bones before taking communion, a practice which she persisted in employing. Opposition to him became openly violent when Cecilian was elected Bishop of Carthage by the clergy of that diocese. He was ordained by Bishop Felix of Aptunga and two other suffragans.

The stage is now set for the first scene of the real schism. Far away in Numidia, Secundus heard that Mensurius had died and that Cecilian had been ordained Bishop in his stead. The venerable man became indignant that the election and ordination of Cecilian had been carried through without the presence and advice of the Numidian Bishops. Moreover he had his doubts as to the wisdom of appointing as bishop such a man as Cecilian, who shared in the compromising attitude of the late Bishop of Carthage toward Traditorism and who had persecuted those who would have aided those cast into prison. So he called his party together and hastened to Carthage. On reaching the city Secundus demanded the removal of Cecilian and insisted upon a new election at which his own group could vote. The Bishopric of Carthage held a place of honor second only to that of Rome, so it was no more than natural that the Numidians would want to share in the election and ordination of the dignitary filling the office. However, according to Cyprian it was the custom "for the nearest bishops of the same province to elect in the presence of the people."

The cause of the Numidians was quickly taken up by Lucilla

and her friends. She gave them certain sums of money to further their cause along. Finding that Cecilian would not withdraw from his new office, Secundus called a Synod in 311. The meeting place was the home of Lucilla. Although Cecilian had been ordered to appear at the meeting, he refused to do so, claiming that he was not subject to the orders of other prelates, being in a higher office than they were. The Synod claimed that since Cecilian had been ordained by Felix of Aptunga, who they said was a traditor, his ordination was not valid, therefore he was not a bishop at all. In his place the Synod elected one named Maiorinus. Donatus of Casæ Nigræ and Sylvanus of Cirta ordained him bishop.

Thus the first scene closes and the schism, which lasted for exactly one century, begins. Maiorinus becomes the first Donatist bishop. Optatus in commenting upon this event says, "The schism was begotten by ambition, nourished by the anger of a disgraced woman, strengthened by greed. So they went out (from the Catholic Church) and set up altar against altar."

The objection which the Donatists raised as the ground for their trip to Carthage and the election of Maiorinus was, as we have seen, undue haste on the part of the Carthaginian bishops in the election of Cecilian as Bishop of Carthage and his invalid ordination. The same criticism can with justice be made against them. They elected their own Bishop of Carthage even though no Carthaginian bishops were present, and ordained him with a bishop officiating at the ordination who was himself a confessed *traditor*, while it was never proven that Felix of Aptunga, the bishop who ordained Cecilian, had been guilty of the offense of handing over the sacred books and vessels.

Most writers on this subject agree that in back of the action of the Numidian bishops was a growing revolt of the African Church against the ever increasing influence of the Pope at Rome. It was an expression of the growing national spirit in the church in Africa which could not yield its power to the Pope at Rome. They were afraid that Cecilian would go even farther than Mensurius had gone in recognizing the supreme authority of the Roman See. In writing of a great leader in Africa during this same

period Burkitt says, "Tyconius was an African by nationality and an African by religion." And Benedict declares that "the real cause of the schism may be traced to the opposition of the reformers to the old system of church building and management, and to the existing laxity in church discipline and purity."

The fact that there were so many great figures among the Donatists gave added weight to the schism and it was not long before the rest of the church knew about it. Constantine interested himself in the affair and soon became influenced by the Pope much to the disadvantage of the Donatists. In 313 the schismatics brought their case to him, but the Emperor referred it to the Pope. He sent two Gaulish bishops to Rome also to aid the Roman prelate in dealing with the matter. Melchides the Pope called fifteen Italian bishops together and held the Roman Synod of 313. Here the Donatists were roundly condemned and the schism ordered to be broken up. However, it was decreed that the Donatist bishops could keep their sees if they would acknowledge Cecilian Bishop of Carthage.

Again the Emperor was appealed to for aid. In answer to this request he sent two Roman bishops to Carthage to decide which party was in the right. These men investigated for forty days and then declared that Cecilian was the real Bishop of Carthage. The Donatists raised the objection that the committee was prejudiced in favor of Cecilian and they were probably right. In 316 Constantine sent for the leaders of the schism. He met them at Milan and having heard them, decided against them. It was not until nearly a hundred years later, in 411, when the great Council at Carthage met, that the schism was finally broken up. In the meantime, many adherents were gained for the Donatist cause, great churches sprang up, much conflict arose and also much persecution was endured.

The greatest figure among the Donatists was Donatus the Great, whose name was given to the schism. Even his opponents recognized his ability and power. He died in exile in Spain about 355. Among the great leaders who followed him were Primian, who because of his moderateness was deposed from leadership by a rigorist party under the guidance of Maximian. In the last

years of the schism Petillian, Gaudentius and Montanus bore the burdens of leadership and defended the Donatists at the Council of Carthage.

Meanwhile a new personality was commanding attention of both the Donatists and their enemies. This man was Augustine. His rise to power was spectacular and his attack on the Donatists was fiery and persistent. He argued with the Donatist leaders, wrote long papers denouncing them and establishing the doctrinal position of the Catholic Church concerning the sacraments. Finally he aided the civil authorities in persecuting them and succeeded in bringing about the Council of 411, where the power of the schism was broken. A close study of the records of those years during which Augustine argued and fought with the Donatists reveals a man of tremendous convictions, a mighty thinker, a splendid defender of the faith but also a very human individual who is more interested in making his point than he is in the manner in which he gains it, who is willing to use force and deception as well as Scripture to bend men to his will.

No incident bears this fact out quite as well as the Council of Carthage in 411. Augustine succeeded in getting Honorius to call the Conference by royal edict. It was the astute Bishop of Hippo who arranged the petition for the meeting without even inquiring whether the Donatists were interested in such a gathering. He dominated the Conference when it did assemble and with the backing the Judge of the Council succeeded in breaking up the schismatics' attempt to justify themselves.

It was the month of June when the Council met. There were 279 Donatist Bishops and 288 Catholic Bishops. The former may have suspected what the purpose of the meeting was but it was only a surmise, for the edict did not state what matters were to be discussed. There was no organization at first. The Romans and the Donatists met informally. Overtures were made by the Catholics in which the Roman prelates said that they would be willing to give up their bishoprics and churches if the outcome of the Conference was favorable to the others. The suggestion was that the Donatists should agree to follow the same procedure in case the decision went against them. The writer has heard it

said, that one of the boasts of Rome is that she never changes. If this is so, then from present appearances and policies, early Romists would never have made any such suggestion unless they were very sure of the outcome of the meeting.

The Conference was called to order by the President, Marcellinus, who read the following rules for procedure. "There shall be seven bishops on each side to manage the debate, seven others to counsel these, four secretaries to take the records and four other bishops to observe the notaries and preserve the records."

Seven men were chosen by each side according to directions. Augustine was the leader for the Catholics and Petillian for the Donatists. Petillian made an effort to have the meetings open to all the bishops so that they might hear the debates. Augustine opposed the idea, saying that with such a large crowd some disturbance might occur which would hinder the progress of the debate. Marcellinus heeded the words of Augustine and refused Petillian's request. The remainder of the first day was spent in preliminary arguments followed by a reading of numerous papers by the Catholics supporting their claim to apostolic succession and kindred ideas. The Conference was then closed by the President for that day.

A week went by and then the second meeting of the Conference was held. Most of the day was taken up with reports of the secretaries. Then a number of speeches were given by both parties. The argument became rather warm. Accusations were made, and in the heat of some of the discussions remarks concerning the character of the debaters were made prominent by their bitterness. The Catholics complained that the Donatists tried to hinder the debate and the Donatists claimed that as yet they had not been officially informed as to the real nature of the meeting. Finally after a rather futile day the Conference was adjourned by Marcellinus.

The third and last meeting of the Conference was the only one which really amounted to a great deal. At the beginning Augustine asked that the Imperial Edict be read again. Emeritus, a Donatist, asked that the Prayer of Petition which caused

Honorius to call the Conference be read. The Catholics objected and Marcellinus sustained their objection. This would have revealed who had asked for the Conference. Petillian forced the issue and accused Augustine and the other Catholic bishops of making the petition and falsely representing the Donatists as desiring the Conference also. The President would not heed the demands of the Donatists that the petition be read, and turned to the next topic which was to be discussed. It happened to be the character of Cecilian. Augustine demanded that the Donatists recede from their position of accusation of Cecilian. They refused. He then demanded that they categorically state which form of evidence they would choose to use in the debate to sustain their contentions; that is, whether they would use secular evidence or scriptural evidence. The Donatists refused to be drawn into error by such a categorical answer, so Augustine offered secular evidence in behalf of Cecilian. He was soon to regret that he had utilized such a method of argument. He was challenged as to his own relation to Cecilian, and as to the manner of his ordination. Augustine was forced to make a categorical answer himself and the result was that his ordination was placed in question because the bishop who ordained him was then in disrepute in the Church, and according to Augustine's own position he had previously taken, he himself was in only a shadowy possession of his ordination.

The final question, which took the rest of the day and the evening, was the real question of the Conference. This was concerning the doctrine of church purity, the validity of the sacraments offered by clergy who were not pure. The Donatists led the attack by reading a long paper, defining their position and quoting many Scriptural passages to sustain their contention. When the debate proper opened, Augustine took the lead and ignoring everything else in the paper confined himself to the question, "whether the church which was predicted by the prophets would have a mixture of good and bad members or whether it would be altogether good, all holy, unspotted in the world, even at that time until the final end of the world." The debate waged long and furiously. The idea of the sacraments entered here. The conception of bap-

tism and rebaptism, the idea of the unity of the church and church membership. Night came upon them as they still argued. Finally the debate centered around the interpretation of the parable of the Tares and the Wheat. Augustine based his recognition of lax church discipline, etc., on his own peculiar interpretation of the sentence, "The field is the world." He claimed that it meant that the field is the church and therefore in it there would be both good and bad. The Donatists refused this interpretation and quoted much Scripture to undermine Augustine's position. The Bishop of Hippo was beginning to get in a sorry plight. It was late in the night, the debate was by no means ended but Marcellinus arose, and declared the Conference at an end. He read an Imperial Edict stating the result of the Conference. His decision was in favor of the Catholics. He advised that the Donatists should effect an immediate return to the Catholic Church and hand over their church property. He stated that punishment, banishment and death would result if these orders were not immediately carried out.

It was the middle of the night. The end of the Conference meant that this time the Imperial Edict was the final statement. They were to go home, these Donatists, back to their people and yet not meet with them, not offer them the sacraments, give up their churches, lose their sees and yield to the Catholic Church. It was a long, hard journey home and a sad one. They had lost their cause. So they went back, many resisting the decision, thereby being exiled, fined and some were killed. The spirit which had sustained the Donatist church was broken and soon after they lost their identity as a separate church.

One thing more must be discussed. What was the conception of the sacraments and the church which these two parties held?

The Donatists did not question the Episcopal foundation of the church. They demanded only that the bishops be holy men and maintained that only such as are holy are capable of administering valid sacraments. They went back to Cyprian for the support of his doctrine. He laid down the rule that sacraments administered by heretics were not valid. He taught that there

was no validity in the prayers and sacrifices of fallen priests. So the Donatists went a step further and said that sacraments administered by immoral or evil priests were not valid. Because of its insistence on personal purity and holiness the Donatists declared that their church was the only Catholic Church, the pure and spotless bride of Christ. The Donatists further refused to sanction any union of church and state. They would have nothing to do with princes and kings if they could avoid it.

The Catholics on the other hand declared that the validity of the sacrament did not rest in the one who administered it, but in the very nature of the sacrament. It was the blessed Trinity which gave it grace and power. So a bishop might be immoral, unscrupulous, dishonest, and yet give to the people the body and blood of Christ. In accordance with this conception they recognized the validity of the sacrament of the Donatist church. The Donatists were called "Brethren," that is, until they aggravated the Catholics, then they were called heretics. The Trinity was necessary for baptism. The administrator of the rite was a variable element. The sacraments were holy but not through men. The Catholics claimed the true church. This was so, they said, for many reasons. For instance, it is the one church because, according to the promise of Christ, it is spread abroad throughout the whole world. It is the holy church not because of the character of its men but because of the Holy Trinity, the Chair of Peter, the faith of the believers, the precepts of Christ and above all the sacraments. The church is holy in the present by virtue of the divine agency exerted within its bounds in the sacraments and it will one day be holy in all its members. Thus briefly was the Catholic position upheld by Augustine at this Council.

Viewed dogmatically the Catholic position was more correct than the Donatist position, yet their victory was a step backward rather than forward. The emphasis which the Donatists placed upon purity and holiness must never be overlooked, nor its importance underestimated. It is well that the sacraments do have a validity other than that which inheres in the clergy itself but it is likewise fortunate when that validity is backed up by a clergy that is pure and holy and upright.

HAS CHRISTIANITY FAILED?

GEORGE RICHMOND GROSE

Peking, China

THE most disturbing question being raised in the religious world in our day is this, "Has Christianity failed?" To say that Christianity has never really tried is a naïvely superficial answer to a serious doubt. If Christianity is all that Christian believers claim it to be in bringing life and hope and peace to the world, and after 2,000 years its disciples have not seriously tried it, either the power of the Gospel or their sincerity is open to question.

Let us frankly face the facts. Christianity has failed to turn the nations to repentance. Its proclamation of peace and good will to men after 2,000 years is mocked by the ever-increasing catastrophe of war. The poor have had the Gospel preached to them, but their poverty has not been removed. In the progress of Christian nations material wealth has been vastly multiplied, but industrial strife has increased also. When the very existence of modern civilization is threatened by widespread surgence of racial hatreds and national prejudices, when modern science has put into the hands of warring nations powerful engines of destruction, when the economic and political measures devised by men are no longer able to give security and social well-being, it is not strange that earnest thinkers trembling for the future of humanity are asking, "Where is salvation to be found?"

Is Christ the hope of the world? Or has Christianity, like many other systems, had its day and will soon cease to be? Is modern science bringing forth truth and power to save the world? Or is the remedy to be found in some new religion whose leader is yet to be proclaimed?

It is superficial to accept these doubts concerning the success of the Christian faith without understanding clearly *what Christianity is expected to do*. When the world seems to be falling to pieces, there is great danger of hysteria. Panic-stricken minds are crying, "Education has failed," "Democracy has failed," "Reli-

gion has failed," "Civilization has failed." *What is Christianity expected to do?*

Manifestly to minister to human need. Since Jesus made his proclamation in the Capernaum synagogue, "The Spirit of the Lord is upon me, he hath anointed me to preach the Gospel to the poor, to recover sight for the blind, release to the captives, to declare the acceptable year of the Lord," Christianity has carried forward this beneficent service. Wherever it has gone Christianity has builded hospitals for the sick, its pity has organized a score of tender ministries. It has discovered worth in the worthless, it has raised up the fallen and the outcast with conquering hope, it has cheered the suffering and the dying with divine consolations.

Manifestly Christianity released a new power for the moral transformation of human nature. The earth is being slowly peopled with twice-born men. Jesus Christ has power—still has power on the earth to forgive sins. Are human lives being changed by the Gospel? Are the minds of individuals being transformed into the mind of Jesus? Is Jesus' way of living making a real difference in the conduct and character of men? This is the supreme test of Christianity. From every land and race and tongue the witnesses come confessing. "He has loved us, and loosed us from our sins by his blood; he made us to be a kingdom, to be priests unto his God and Father: to him be the glory and the dominion forever and ever." The testimony of saved men with their purposes ennobled, with their character changed, with their minds transformed, proclaims Christianity has not failed.

But there are vast tracts of the world's life that have not been explored by the Gospel messenger. Are war and industrial strife and national hatreds and racial antagonisms and social injustices beyond the reach of Christianity? Has Jesus no commanding voice in the forums of to-day? Has the Christian religion no right to challenge the practices of the street and the business of the market? If so, Christianity is doomed as an outgrown system. If it cannot so relate itself vitally and effectively to the conditions of the modern world as to make the mind of Jesus the mind of the world men will rightly turn to other religions or from all reli-

gions as futile. Christ must save others—all others who will come to him—else Christ himself cannot be saved.

But how is the life of the present-day world to be made Christian? How are war and greed and hate to be overcome? Not by physical force, but by spiritual weapons. "Not by might nor by power, but by my Spirit, saith the Lord." This is still the supreme strategy of spiritual conquest. Teaching truth, setting forth principles, planting germinating ideals—this is the method of the Gospel. It is the yeast, the salt, the light method of conquest, not the external method—the law, the sword and trade. We cannot win the fight for justice and righteousness alone by massing the vote of the Christian churches in the parliaments and councils of the nations, but rather by capturing individuals and groups by the truth and spirit of the Master. There are vast reserves of spiritual power upon which the followers of Jesus have not drawn. There are celestial legions still at the command of those who will trust their all to Christ. The lack of faith in the resistless might of a righteous cause, the doubt of Christ's power to save to the uttermost the sinners of our day, the reliance upon machinery and methods to bring in the kingdom of God's love—this is the shame of the church to-day.

But the kingdom of God is to come into the present world not alone by individual conversions, not alone by spiritual culture. Christianity has a responsibility for the creation of right public opinion. The atmosphere of the present world must be made Christian before the fruits of a Christian civilization can flourish. With the coming of spring, there is no need to attack the ice banks and snow heaps with pick and shovel. The spring air will soon break the icy bands of winter everywhere. Like changes have been wrought and are being wrought daily by the steady growth of Christian sentiment. Slavery could not live to-day in any nation, though supported by vast armies and great wealth. The Christian sentiment of the world has made it forever impossible. The right of women to education, the right of childhood to a decent physical inheritance, the abolition of the curse of drunkenness—these are the moral and social triumphs of Christian public opinion. The bold and ceaseless proclamation of any great moral ideal

or spiritual principle that means larger rights and richer life for men will inevitably change public sentiment and bring in a new day for humanity. Christianity has not failed. The yeast of its truth is leavening the whole lump of human life. Christianity is no doubtful experiment. Its truth is no mere speculation or theory. It is the power of God for human salvation everywhere. Jesus Christ is final. He is the last word. If he has not the truth by which men find the way to life, if he has not the power and love to light and to save the world, there is no hope. If the Christian church is doomed, then humanity is lost. If the Gospel fails, the death warrant of the world is sealed. But Christianity has not failed simply because it has not captured completely the externals of life. No dogma exhausts its truth. No sacrament limits its grace. No organization controls its energies. No priest or poet has fathomed its mysteries. No saint has explored the riches of its treasures. "Eye hath not seen, ear hath not heard, neither hath it entered into the heart of man to conceive the things God has prepared for them that love him." The truth of Christianity is to be more perfectly unfolded. Guided by Christian principles, thought will explore vast realms of Christian truth which now lie hidden from our view. In the fellowship of the Christian Church, we ought to find a more complete realization of Christian unity than Christendom has known. The scandal of denominational divisions will cease as the church girds itself in earnestness for its real task. In the communion of the Church of God we ought to realize richer interpretations of Christian experience than the Western Church has yet given to the world. We ought to see the precepts of Jesus becoming the practices of the street. We will see the war-lords banished and the spiritual forces sitting upon the twelve thrones judging the world.

The evident successes of Christianity which have been pointed out above give promise of the steady ongoing and final victory of the cause of Christianity. But there are other signs of Christ's coming more effectively into the life of the present world. The historic Jesus stands forth more vividly to-day than in any century since the first. There was no more certainly a great expectation cherished among the leaders in religious thought before the

Christian era of the coming of One who was to bring to the nation salvation than the world's expectation now centers in Jesus. There is an increasing intellectual conviction that if men would believe and act like Jesus, social justice would speedily come. Wherever men have the courage to combine his devotion to God with his passion for the service of men, earthly life is actually being changed. Young men unafraid to die are crying, "There shall be no more war." The missionary passion is not spent. The power of the cross is not burned out. The determination is deepening daily that weak people shall be protected, not exploited, that men of all races shall be treated as brothers. Is not this the beginning of the new earth?

But has not Christianity failed to win the world? Yes, but so much the worse for the world. Science has not failed because truth is not universally accepted. The success of science is in putting illimitable *physical* treasures at the command of intelligent effort. The success of Christianity depends upon whether or not Jesus can and is making good his claim to redeem individual lives from the power of sin, and to establish in the earth righteousness, justice and peace through obedience to his truth.

Has Christianity failed? What is it expected to do? To save individual sinners who confess Christ from the guilt of their sins and to give a new incarnation of Christ as wide as the confines of the human race in the church which is his body. It is expected to give such an intense personal realization of Christ in experience as will make the believer cry out in ecstatic confidence, "I *know* Whom I have believed." It is expected to seize upon Jesus' fundamental principle—the infinite worth of a man—and to set him in the midst of our industries, in the midst of our schools, at the very center of our institutions—and operate them all for his good. Christianity is expected to reveal to us an Almighty God and Father, like unto Jesus Christ. So long as men see in the face of Jesus the moral and spiritual likeness of God, Christianity has not failed. Our doubt of Christianity is born in our limited vision of the sweep of its energies and the reach of its power. The world has not exhausted Christ. He is the last word.

FACING THE CONGREGATION

EDWARD L. WATSON,

Baltimore, Md.

It is 11:30 A. M. Sunday. You are in your pulpit facing your congregation. Why are you there? What will you do? What preparation have you made? Can you justify yourself in being there? And the congregation, what of them? Those who compose it have come expectant, hungry, depressed, tempted and needy. Will you satisfy their need? Or will it be a mere performance and must they depart unsatisfied and disappointed? Surely to meet such an hour, to feed immortal souls with Bread, requires high qualifications. It is insult to God and man to have but chaff to offer. Your being there means you are to preach a sermon.

The sermon is the greatest creation of language. Ian MacLaren said: "The most critical and influential event of the religious week is the sermon." Dean Brown says: "The office of the preacher is the creation, the nurture and the direction of the Christian Impulse." "The most conspicuous single service of the week is the making and delivery of the sermon." John Ruskin put it well, "Thirty minutes to raise the dead." "Seeing the multitude, he opened his mouth and taught them, saying." So the preacher gives his soul to God that he might satisfy the needs of immortal men.

The church is realizing more than ever the value of the sermon. Never such competition as between pulpit and press, between theater and movie, college and seminary, and never greater preparation of the prophet for his pulpit. The sacredness and significance of the sermon grow upon the preacher. To awaken a sense of the majesty of the hour when the preacher faces the congregation is the motive of this paper.

A sense of resentment possesses us when we find the modern pulpit overwhelmed by drives and campaigns, details of business,

that prevent the prophet finding and delivering his word from God. Protestantism can do no greater service to itself than to clear the deck for the preacher. For the many things to be said of preacher and sermon, you are referred to the lectureships and homiletics of the schools. The technique, the theology, the style of the sermon must be passed by, as we are concerned only with the preacher when he faces the congregation.

Much should have happened before he appears before his people. Many a preacher errs in thinking that contact with the congregation will supply stimulus to successful presentation of his message. As if God in condonation of his servant's remissness, grants gratuitous illumination and power. Nay, inspiration is intellection, that thorough thinking through which wide reading and profound study alone can give. If he has not known the preaching mood in the study, the sermon is doomed to failure. As R. C. Gillie says: "The warm heart at the desk means the warm heart in the pulpit. We have no right to tears in our voice unless tears have been in our hearts in the study."

The chief hindrance to sermon preparation is spiritual inertia. "Every sermon is a battle." We must to the business of composition with the grimness of a warrior, as a Browning to his verse, a Turner to his canvas, a Caruso to his score. This is the chief conflict of the preacher's week. Let him fail here and he is doomed.

There is something mystic and divine in the coming of the word to the prophet. It may drive him into the wilderness with John Baptist. Flaming bushes in the wilderness may shine as to Moses. The temple may reveal Him in its vaulted heights, the silences of nature speak as to Finney, or he may agonize on the ground as Whitefield under the stars. Study, meditation, grief may furnish the Gethsemane for his soul ere he come forth with his word from God. Surely the congregation fail to comprehend the birth pangs out of which the sermon is born.

Now the sermon is prepared. It is written. It is a manuscript, but it is not yet a message. The next important step is that the preacher get possession of the sermon. That is, no man has gotten a sermon till the sermon gets him. It must "grip"

him. As Hoyt of Crozer says: "He must have a sense of message." It is a lately learned lesson for many of us, that the preacher is not prepared to deliver his sermon till he possesses it. I beg you will mark the word.

You have come to Saturday night, and on re-reading your manuscript it seems jejune, platitudinous and dull. It seems remote from life. What must you do? You must bind your personality to it. You must make it part of yourself. You must "feel" it in your soul. For myself, I go on a pilgrimage with it. One must repeat aloud the whole order of thought from introduction to the end. At least, if not aloud, creative mental verbal composition must retrace arguments and illustrations in orderly process, that the mind be made familiar with the verbiage and the thought kindle the heart into a glow. Then is born that sense of message, the realization that to you God has entrusted a word of life. The possession of the sermon seals itself with a mingled sense of awe, of wonder and of joy.

Having prepared and possessed the sermon, you are now about to begin your utterance: What are your feelings at this moment? First—There must be an absence of any self-consciousness whatever. A man's very earnestness may create constraint, but it will hamper him. Not that one should be unconcerned. The burden on the soul, the pressure of the congregation, the destinies depending are all too much for ease; yet there must be a sense of daring, an assurance of God's presence, a realization that we are his messengers.

Nothing gives poise to the preacher at this time as does his sense of preparedness, that in the study and on his knees he has thoroughly made ready for this very hour.

It is in place to say that his physical fitness stands him in good stead at the point where all human powers are taxed to their utmost. A chapter might be given to the bodily regimen whereby the prophet fits his body to be the instrument of the Divine Spirit. The sturdy strength of health is a greater pulpit asset than the anemia of cloister and study.

It may be as well to show here that facing the congregation brings its reflex upon the preacher from the congregation as well

as vice versa. His business it is to affect the congregation; they necessarily affect him.

First of all, there are physical factors in the very setting of the sermon. The architecture, the lights, the atmosphere, and the color scheme have their effect upon both preacher and people. An echo may spell disaster. The music often damns the sermon even as does poor ventilation. A good sexton is the gift of God. Let him who possesses such thank God and take courage.

But the congregation concerns us. Have you thought what is the chief factor in the making of a great preacher? Probably you regard him as born to it as is the poet or musician. Then you think of Beecher or Parker, Whitefield or Spurgeon. But you have overlooked the fundamental factor. Well, then, it is training and a great mind, and you visualize mentally Storrs and Robertson, South and Wesley, Jonathan Edwards and Lyman Beecher. If this is not the answer you say then a God-filled man makes the great preacher and William Arthur, Alexander MacLaren, Henry Bascom, Alexander Whyte, A. J. Gordon, Charles G. Finney and D. L. Moody come forth from your memories. Desperately you continue, if not this makes the great preacher, it is scholarship, the modern outlook and the mystic spirit. R. J. Campbell, S. P. Cadman, Orchard, Kelman, Fosdick, McConnell, McDowell, Charles R. Brown, J. H. Jowett, give you illustrations.

You have not yet answered the question, What makes the great preacher? It is the congregation which makes the preacher as verily as the violin gives Paganini or Kreisler, or the organ Mendelssohn their opportunities for music. The preacher fails for lack of hearers, and it is up to his officials to devise means by which the prophet may be given that essential of true preaching, an adequate audience. It is the pathos of the prophet's task that often he is denied a hearing of a message altogether worthy that the world should hear.

So much for the need of a congregation that we have not. Now of the congregation we have. The congregation has its own character. It is an entity as the man in the pulpit. A liberal preacher in a fundamentalist congregation or vice versa presents

a problem. There must be *rapprochement* between the two. Malignant animal magnetism is, I believe, the devil of Christian Science. There is devil enough when such antipathies prevail as between pulpit and pew. The prophet wilts, for eloquence always needs a warm atmosphere. It takes but little frost to kill this tender plant.

I recall a title, *Taking Pull out of Pulpit*, and found myself facing the church boss sitting in the upper seats of the synagogue. Such a personality deflects the aim and chills the power of utterance of the prophet. Funeral obsequies for such come none too soon. *Requiescat in pace*. A great chapter needs to be written on the psychological reflexes of the congregation upon the preacher.

Too long we have tarried in the pew. Let us return to the pulpit where as yet the prophet waits to open his mouth. But before he speaks, another word is in place, ere he is fitted to give his message. He must be expectant. Something is going to happen. God is pledged to work miracles through his word. Most of those who have come to hear us are eager, or hungry, or needy, they wish God to bless them. Few are agnostic or antipathetic. Their mood is favorable toward us. We should look for the surprises of His power, for water from the rock, for reversals of worldly lives and the renewal of the degenerate.

Here we come on what Charles R. Brown calls the soul of the sermon. All that has gone before is in preparation for, is in expectation of the Holy Spirit. It is the Holy Spirit which gives the sermon its soul. The preaching of a sermon is more than a human transaction. There are three parts to it: the preacher, the congregation and the Holy Spirit. Another and Higher Energy comes in. Great psychic and spiritual forces are operating upon the preacher and his hearers quite apart from the will of the preacher.

Rufus Jones says Paul writes as an expert in dynamics. His *Ægean Gospel* suggests that God circulates as energy. Many names he gives of this Dynamic: The Spirit, the Holy Spirit, Christ, Christ in You. Power is a word often on the lips of Jesus. The kingdom of God comes with power. Ten legions of angels

are on guard in Pilate's Prætorium, a divine life-transforming energy is ready to operate. It is light, it is yeast. Pentecost witnessed an invasion, the inrush and upwelling sense of power. It brought about: "Heightened moral quality, intensified fellowship, a fused and undying loyalty, an irresistible boldness, a God-consciousness, a fortification of spirit nothing could break through."

Preaching is to permit the energizing of this spirit both in the soul of the prophet and in that of the congregation. When this operates we have preaching, the sermon has found its soul. Men realize God is present. This divine element is the sermon's greatest asset. It crowns the preacher as a king. The pulpit becomes a throne. The hearts of men are in your hands to mold them for God.

Such a man has no competitor in press or novel or theater. Yours is to bring God immediately to men, to make them realize his presence; "against such there is no law." They are supreme. Charles G. Finney, Dwight L. Moody, A. J. Gordon are types of the spiritual irresistibles.

Rufus Jones speaks of the breaking through of the beyond. Electricity is power emerging from the infinite. The electric light is where it breaks through. I stood entranced in a garden of dahlias. Color, size, variety combined to dazzle the eye. Out of the mystic combination of air and sun, of dew and rain and soil emerged beauty. Beauty broke forth at the flower. We have read how MacMillan under the arctic skies in the snows received by radio music from Los Angeles and Hawaii. Music breaks through from the beyond. The pulpit is the place where the Holy Ghost breaks through. Happy is the man who has what the old preachers called liberty, but the modern "the release of personality." Such preaching cannot be dull. It is vital. It is dynamic. It throbs and thrills with God. Men are fed, are comforted, are regenerated. There is an old English adage: "Cases are won in chambers." Men do not win them in courts. Preparation, arduous and long, in school and study, registers its results at the bar.

Sermons are won in the study, in meditation in Gethsemanes.

The preparation, the possession of the sermon and the expectancy of faith through the Holy Spirit give to the sermon its soul.

Now that we have detained the preacher till we have considered his preparation both of himself, and his message, the Gethsemanes of blood and sweat out of which the word of the Lord is born, his possession of the sermon, till manuscript becomes a burning fire in his bones, his poise, his assurance of God's presence, his physical fitness for God's uses of his body for his soul's sake, the reflex influence on him of his congregation or the lack of one, his expectancy of something to happen when through the Holy Spirit the sermon finds its soul and when finally the Divine Dynamic operates through him as its instrument, releasing his personality in a liberty of utterance which thrills him with unspeakable joy—having so long detained him, facing the congregation, I now bid him speak his word of eternal life and may God bless him, for the man facing the congregation Sunday next at 11:30 A. M. is You.

THE DOCTRINAL BASIS OF EVANGELISM

CLARENCE TRUE WILSON

Washington, D. C.

"Upon this rock will I build my church."—Matt. 16. 18.

OUR fathers had a group of teachings which they called "The Saving Doctrines." Are there doctrines in the Sacred Scriptures and in the Christian Church which may properly be designated "saving"?

In a strict sense, it might be just as proper to say that wagons are edible because our food is brought to us in wagons.

Doctrines convey saving truth, but it is not the formulary that saves. It is Divine Truth that saves, and not the mode of conveying it. Nevertheless, we think there are doctrines that may be designated "saving doctrines," because they are the ones that bring with them "saving truth."

1. When we would take aim with a saving message, we instinctively turn toward certain phases of truth, which may have been long neglected but must be brought out in sermons that are after souls.

2. The churches that have preached the evangelical truths have won. The churches that have adopted negative creeds are still harping their negative tones but nobody follows them. Unitarianism and Universalism are so easy in their requirements that a worldling would suppose they would take the world, but they have never taken anything. They have nothing to take it with. Unitarianism has leaves but it is a barren fig tree.

3. There are certain truths which, emphasized, produce conviction:

There is a personal God who cares for us.

Man is a responsible spirit and is immortal.

God has made known his thought and his law to his human children by an inspired Book.

He sent Jesus, his own, his only and his beloved Son, Im-

manuel, to be our Saviour, and there is no salvation apart from him.

The guilt of sin; the necessity of repentance; forgiveness through faith alone; regeneration which makes one a new creature, capable of perfecting holiness in the fear of God.

These high ideals produce dissatisfaction with oneself and dependence upon God.

Set the moral firmament ablaze with these incandescent lights and sinners will still hoist the flag of total and irreversible self-surrender as they did when our fathers preached them. But only a Triune God is equal to the occasion, an underived God, Father, Creator, Sustainer, immanent, transcendent; a divine Christ, sent from the Eternal Father, Spirit-conceived and virgin born, crucified, risen, ascending, reigning now; and a personal, immanent Holy Spirit, the Executive of the God-head.

Let the human arches reverberate with these immortal verities and men will not ignore us or despise our message. They cannot resist Divine Truth set forth in terms of faith that casts out fear and doubt.

I was preaching for a brother once, when he said, "Wilson, if I could only believe these things as you do, I could preach them too."

I replied, "The difference is, you doubt your beliefs and believe your doubts. I doubt my doubts and believe my beliefs."

A minister of the Gospel must have faith enough for himself and to compensate the people's lack of faith. He is called of God, set apart by the Church, kept from secular concerns, that he may come to his pulpit and pastoral work seeing the invisible, living with the Divine, counteracting all the doubts, the fears, the world currents, circulating through the folks he ministers to.

Our experience will certainly affirm that we can never build a faith by preaching our doubts or even the negative results of our own scholarship. The world is to be saved by the truth, alive, incarnate in a man who believes it, soul and body and spirit, is preaching it because he can't help but proclaim it and would die for it if necessary.

There is a psychological law which prevents any truth mak-

ing a deeper impression on the soul of the hearer than it is making in the heart and mind of the speaker. That is what the native congregation in China wanted when they came to Bishop Bashford and requested: "Give us a missionary with a hot heart." They have learned in heathendom what we have been slow to find out in Christendom, that we get nowhere in winning or saving the world by the chipping away through negative processes of that Word which is the Gibraltar of our faith.

I have recently been impressed with this truth—that the archeologist has confirmed, illustrated and illuminated our inspired and inspiring Book. Wherever he has sent his spade down into ancient ruins, whether it be Babylon, Nineveh, Tyre, Ur of the Chaldeas, he has brought up some great statement that confirms our historic book and our gospel message.

The archeologist digs for facts. The critic runs the line of his own shallow guesses up through his conceit and that line reaches so far that he thinks he has a private wire to God. That is why the critic is very deep in shallow matters.

We have been feeding the church for a generation on the results of historic criticism and ignoring the findings of the great scientists known as archeologists. Our Conference Course of Study has a dozen books in it that recognize or repeat these so-called results of a critical method and not one book in the sixty on archeological discoveries concerning the New Testament or the Old. It is a serious thing to load a mind that God called to be his prophet and priest with distracting doubts and such negative results of other men's guesses that as he stands there in the pulpit to lead men to faith he breeds doubt instead.

There is a beautiful New Testament story of an ancient priest ministering in the sanctuary to make the people realize God and accept his word, and there appeared unto him an angel of the Lord, standing on the right side of the altar of incense, and Zacharias was told that because his supplication was heard, his wife Elisabeth should bear him a son who should be called John, the forerunner of the Christ. "But Zacharias said to the angel, Whereby shall I know this, for I am an old man and my wife well stricken in years? The angel answering said: I

an Gabriel, that stand in the presence of God; and I was sent to speak unto thee, and to bring thee these good tidings. And behold, thou shalt be silent and not able to speak until the day that these things come to pass, because thou believedst not my words, which shall be fulfilled in their season" (Luke 1. 18-20).

Here was a man standing up to teach faith to the people who himself was an unbeliever, instilling doubts where he ought to have inspired confidence, demanding a sign that would make truth visible, and the angel of the Presence said, "You shall have a sign. You shall be dumb, unable to utter a word for nine months." Unbelief locked the mouth of a minister. Think of the anguish of knowing and not being able to tell, of an imprisoned message, a truth in jail, locked in by unbelief. This did not stop the Divine purpose, but it pictured for all time God's contempt of prophets who for a piece of bread preach and do not believe.

Recently I was riding toward a great Methodist convention in Indianapolis when I met a young minister on the train, who said he did not believe in preaching doctrinal sermons and regarded doctrinal discussions as so much "hot air." I replied, "That is where you and your Master differ. He thought sound doctrine was not 'hot air' but a rock—firm enough to build a Church upon that the Gates of Hell should not prevail against and that the ages would not overthrow. When he asked his disciples, 'Whom do men say that I, the Son of man, am?' they gave him various rumors about his origin. He followed with the query, 'Whom do ye say that I am?' and when Simon, the spokesman for the rest, confessed, 'Thou art the Christ, the Son of the Living God,' Jesus answered and said unto him, 'Blessed art thou, Simon Bar-Jonah, for flesh and blood have not revealed it unto thee but my Father who is in Heaven. I also say unto thee, thou art Peter, and upon this rock will I build my church.'" And he has been building on that rock ever since, and every church that gets off the rock ceases to be a growing church and is headed for oblivion.

The lesson is, it takes a Divine Christ to make a Christian Church and the doctrine of Christ's Deity is proven by the history of the Christian Church not only to be essential to its growth

but it is also in strict accord with nature. It is not without significance that a list of the growing churches of Jesus Christ and another list of the retrograde diminishing churches that take his name, are two separate companies, with a line of demarkation between them that distinguishes evangelical Christianity from unevangelical.

There is only one place in the universe where you can find all moral values. It is not in nature—too many snakes and earthquakes; not in history—too many wars and intrigues; not in society—too much selfishness and sin; not in humanity—too much weakness and wickedness. These values are found only in Jesus Christ.

The key to the great Christian belief that is winning the world is not education, refinement, correctness of creedal formulas or historic claims. It is not in the wealth of the members, or the standing of the clergy, or the fame of the edifice. The key is and always has been and will be while the universe stands, the Trinity, because the universe was made by a Triune God and everything in it harmonizes with his personality. Try it anywhere and the key fits the lock of nature.

Try it on this table. You have color, shape and size. You do not know the table until you know these three relations.

Try it in the physical universe and you find it mineral, vegetable and animal.

Try it on this speech. You have the communicating mind, the receptive soul and the sound wave of communication, a trinity in unity to make one speech.

Try it on yourself. I look at you and say, "You are a high man, a low man, a heavy man, a light man." I have no reference in this to either your mental equipment or moral nature, but I call that MAN, though I am only talking of a body. I speak of you as a bright man, a wise man, an educated man. I have no reference to your body or soul. I am speaking of mental characteristics, but we call that MAN, yet I am only talking of your mind. I rise a little and begin to speak of you as a good man, true man, noble man, a Godly man. I am now speaking only of the moral qualities of your soul, but I call that MAN. Here we

have three proper divisions of man and yet everyone knows that we are speaking of one person, in three-foldness.

As long as men have common sense and know these essentials of their own being, even horse sense, which is stable thinking, they will never deny a Trinity in Unity to the God-head while conscious of being made in his image, and having a trinity in unity in themselves.

Take your minds. The psychologists tell us two things: that our mental operations demand a triune explanation; that we have an intellect to think, sensibilities to feel and will to determine. But modern psychology is equally emphatic in the declaration this is not three minds but one mind. That is the scientist's way of saying that he believes in a trinity in unity.

When Jesus was upon earth, he set up certain claims. The ages have investigated those claims and if they ever prove to be unscientific, that is, out of harmony with the nature of things, the laws of the universe, those claims and their maker will be rejected.

He said, "I and the Father are one." A little farther down in the same chapter of John's Gospel, he says, "But the Father is greater than I." Shallow thinkers have said, "Contradiction." "If he is one with the Father, he cannot be less." But if you will take Christ's favorite illustration, "I am the light of the world," and go to that for light, you will find that the sun is the source of the light and the heat, that the light has been streaming from the sun since there was a sun, and is therefore as old as the sun and is of one substance, power and glory with the sun; yet the sun, being the source, is greater than either the light or its heat. The sun is the source and represents the Father. The light proceedeth from the sun and according to the idiom of the New Testament, represents the Son; that the heat has eternally proceeded from the Son, and the light, as the Holy Spirit, proceedeth from the Father and the Son.

A little lesson in the A B C's of nature will say that the sun, the light and the heat are one, but that the sun is greater than the other two which proceed from it, and never while the sun shines

in heaven, will the eternal Sonship of Jesus Christ fail to win the thoughts of men.

When I was in Portland, Oregon, I used to read Hebrew three mornings a week with a noted Jewish rabbi. One morning the rabbi, as we were waiting for another brother to come in, said to me, "I suppose you hold to the doctrine of the Eternal Sonship of Jesus Christ?" "Yes," I replied. "That is exactly what I hold and teach and preach." He replied, "Don't you see that the very term 'Sonship' is contradictory to the term 'Eternal'?" I replied, "Then you believe only in the Eternal Father?" "Yes," said the rabbi. I said, "When you can explain to me how God can be an Eternal Father without an Eternal Son, I will explain all the other mysteries of the faith to you, for an Eternal Father can no more exist without an Eternal Son than a Son can exist without a Father."

That is one thing that is perfectly reciprocal in this world; that a father no more makes a son than a son makes the man the father.

These truths about the Tri-une God and the Deity of Christ, the personal agency of the Spirit, are firmly imbedded in the book of nature; they are just as much preached by the vine with its root and branches as they are by the sun in the sky and the triune personality of man.

The secret of the success of the church is a clear-cut doctrinal contention that it is willing to state and defend against all comers, profess in life and to die for if necessary. And it is not worth while to expect human nature to be willing to die for negative, hair-splitting distinctions that have no background in the nature of things.

The way to kill a minister or a missionary is to kill his sense of God. When one has not this realization, he is off center, that is, eccentric. "Wandering stars" are simply stars off center, "for which is reserved the blackness of darkness forever." To be centered right is to be fixed in our relations to God.

A real revival that shall mean the incoming of God into thought, life, experience, service, is long overdue. The church needs it to do its work; the world must have it to be saved. There-

fore, I make bold to declare what a lifetime of study of the revival periods in the church will confirm, that no revivals have ever come through preaching uncertainties. No revivals have ever come through merely ethical preaching. No revival has ever come through so-called practical preaching.

Every revival in the history of the Christian Church was based on a restatement, a new emphasis of preaching in the assurance of faith of some fundamental doctrine of belief big enough to fix one's faith and rest one's soul upon. A question mark is a very poor resting place for a tired soul. I care not where you turn, if only you will listen to the sounding out of the doctrinal note.

Someone said that Peter's sermon on the day of Pentecost was nothing but an exhortation. I maintain that analyzed and weighed it is one of the greatest doctrinal discussions of the Christian ages. In it he preaches Jesus and proves him to be the Divine Son of God, now in session at his Father's right hand, sending the Holy Spirit in answer to the promise of the Father and the prayer of the disciples; "He hath shed forth this which ye see and hear"; the personality, Deity and mission of the Holy Spirit on earth and in human hearts, convicting of sin and to the penitent revealing the personal Saviour.

The sermon is based on a Trinity and gives us a doctrinal discussion of Joel's prophecy that culminates and is fulfilled in Pentecost.

When Saint Augustine was preaching, it was the Sovereignty of God. When Luther revived Christendom, his major emphasis was the doctrine of justification by faith alone. When Wesley and Whitefield preached, it was a knowable religion attainable right now by repentance and faith. When Finney led his great campaign, it was the justice of God's law, the truth of his threatenings and the possibilities of immediate salvation by repentance toward God and faith toward our Lord, Jesus Christ. When Moody and Sankey thrilled the multitudes, it was with the Father heart of God loving his wayward children. When Sam Jones and Billy Sunday thundered, it was to call men back to the severity of God's punishment of sin. When the Welsh revival

came, it was to emphasize the death of Jesus made necessary by human sin and making possible the salvation of every penitent.

The most remarkable thing in our day is the Irish revival. Do you recall how a few months ago every time we opened our morning paper we expected to hear of another fight in Ireland, of buildings dynamited, a church destroyed by incendiarism, a conflict on the streets and heads crushed with either a Protestant or a Roman Catholic shillaly? Suddenly all that stopped and we heard nothing more from Ireland for ten months or a year. We have lately discovered why. A gracious religious revival emphasizing the Fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man is on and Roman Catholic priests and Protestant ministers are meeting together in scores of places to pray for the extension of the work of grace.

In recent weeks you and I have had the privilege of hearing a Spirit-filled man, with a wondrously illumined mind, calling us back to the realities and verities of the Gospel—Stanley Jones with a message centering in the personal efficiency and power of Jesus Christ. He is stirring the heart and mind of our church wherever he goes. But what does he say? I took it down from his lips, "We used to make the miracles carry Jesus. Now we see he carries them. To get acquainted with Jesus is to believe easily in his Virgin Birth as the only adequate explanation of him; in his Resurrection, for we see that it was not possible that he should be holden of death. Sin and death go together. We know that Jesus escaped sin, hence, of course, he would escape death. The miracles are calls back to the real natural. A correction of sin. The thirteenth chapter of First Corinthians came out of the broken heart of a discredited apostle. He writes them about what love is and will do and it is the poem of the centuries on love."

Calvary came out of sin. Sin was that reality that was such a serious malady that it broke the heart of God and brought the Christ of heaven to earth. And a slurring over of sin on our part will leave us without deep conviction for it. No deep conviction of sin, then no genuine repentance; no genuine repentance for sin, hence no radical conversion from it; no radical conver-

sions, then no distinct and aggressive Christian lives; no distinguished and outstanding Christian lives and the formal church. Into a formal church, no conversions. Children are not born into that kind of a family.

I recently heard of a minister holding up to scorn the penitent words of David, "Against thee only have I sinned and done that which was evil in thy sight." He talked about Uriah and his wife, the bad example set by the king, the desecration of the king's character before the people, as if that were the supreme thing, and held David's words up about the relation of sin to God as though they were an exaggeration. There was no exaggeration, in those words, brethren. Except for God, there could be no such thing as sin.

There might be vice, evil, crime. Vice is an ethical idea that has to do with public morals. Evil is a generic term for those conditions which shock the sentiments of mankind. Crime is an offense against the state. But sin is a theistic conception. It is an offense against God. If there were no God, there could be no sin. So the poet David was literally correct when he said, "Against thee, and thee only, have I sinned." He had committed a crime against the state, evil among his people, fallen into deep vice and all that, but the sin was against God and in his penitence he stated correctly that his offense was against God and had to do with him.

How faithfully the Bible characters stated this truth. Joseph is tempted to commit a great crime. But the sense of God nerved him in the conflict and saved from the ruin. He spurned the tempter from him with the words, "How can I do this great wickedness and sin against God?"

The prodigal son gathered his portion together and took his journey into a far country. He had cast off the restraints of home and gone wrong, lost his patrimony, his clothes are in rags and his character is frayed out as well; wasted his substance and himself in riotous living. Pure selfishness bred lawlessness, for selfishness means riot, vice, crime, opposition to law. But when the prodigal came to himself, he looked away from all these infelicities of his condition and in his penitence he came to right

views of his relation to the Higher Power and said, "I will arise and go to my father and will say, 'Father, I have sinned against heaven and in thy sight, and am no more worthy to be called thy son.'" It was the relation of sin to God that brought him to penitence and the philosophy of all true repentance and of all genuine revivals and of all correct evangelism centers here, that a Supreme God is offended by human sin. This makes a deep and pungent conviction, a thorough and heart-felt repentance, a radical and transforming conversion. In other words, every penitent has a doctrinal basis for his prayers.

Every man's life is a plan of God with a high aim, but sin is a missing of the mark. It misses the high-water mark of character and the standard of noble service as well. It turns the influence of the sinner against the God he was made to worship, to love and to serve, and the clearest idea of sin is found in defining it to be the abuse of moral freedom. It is the act, therefore, of an independent moral creature. Its center and source is the will. As such it is an act of selfishness. Ceasing to acknowledge God as the center and source of life and authority who ought to be obeyed, the sinner becomes himself a center and source of conduct. Thus the divine order for man's life is broken and the sinner shapes his own acts according to his own will. We are told that "the angels which kept not their first estate but left their own habitation, he hath reserved under chains of darkness to be reserved unto the judgment of the great day." This is a text on anarchy. "First estate." This is the word, "archee," for head of government. The word here is "a," the privitive for "no" and "archee," government, equals "no government." That is the flag they hoisted in Hell. Man did not originate this rebellion but became an accessory and the conflict which originated in other worlds is being fought out in ours now.

This relation of sin to God is illustrated by the experience of the father who took his child, a Sunday school boy, on an expedition of theft. When they came to the neighbor's fruit tree, the thief carefully looked around to every point of the compass and put forth his hand to pluck the ripened fruit, when the child's voice startled him with, "Father, you forgot to look up." And

it is just this leaving God out of the account, forgetting to look up, that constitutes sin.

The Bible always treats of sin as a serious matter. It names it an offense against God, a trespass, an iniquity, a transgression, a want of conformity, lawlessness, unrighteousness, it says, "Everyone that doeth sin doeth also lawlessness and sin is lawlessness." "All unrighteousness is sin." It is illustrated by comparing it with an unfruitful tree, an unfaithful steward, ungrateful children, harlotry, a sow wallowing in the mire, a dog returning to his vomit. God gives his warning of its nature in clear mutterings of conscience, the course of providence, some deathbed scenes, and the divine character. It is such a real experience that God and man must reckon with it. Sin is the act of rebellion against the law and love of God. In God, love and law are one, and our relation to him and abhorrence of lawlessness should be such that we could neither think of despising his government or his heart.

The true aim of our being is communion with God as Father and obedience to God as Sovereign. He is the center to which in love and obedience we were made to gravitate and around whom as the true orbit of the moral universe we should revolve.

Saint Augustine said, "Oh God, Thou hast made us for Thyself and our hearts are restless until we rest in Thee." Our wills are ours to make them thine, but our Father complains, "I have nourished and brought up children and they have rebelled against me. My people have committed two evils. They have forsaken me, the fountain of living waters, and have hewn them out cisterns, broken cisterns that can hold no water" (Jer. 2. 13; see whole chapter).

There are men with scholastic tendencies who are always getting out of practical problems by asking theoretical questions. One asked, "Is sin a reality?"

I replied, "Reality is not limited to entities. All reality may be distributed under three categories: substances, attributes and relations. Sin is not a substance, takes nothing from, adds nothing to the material of the universe. It is not an attribute, being rather an act than a characteristic of humanity, yet it is a reality and not a mere negative. It is real as a relation. It sets up a

false and wrong relation toward God, fellow creature and self. It is an evil reality of being in a wrong attitude toward God, toward nature and toward goodness."

Sin is selfish because it ignores God; lawless because it rebels against him; all unrighteousness is sin because it separates from God and ruinous because by it we miss the true end for which we were created. Such a life is self-destructive.

Were you ever stung by a bee? It hurt for a moment, possibly for an hour, but the bee was ruined. It lost its sting and went off to die. Such are the consequences of everyone who stings God. He sustains such a vital relation to us and has such a large interest in us that any transgression to his will is a blow to his heart. But he has so constituted us that the blow reacts. "They that regard lying vanities forsake their own mercy." "He that sinneth against me ruineth his own soul."

Is it surprising that sin could not be wrought without consequences? "Thinkest thou, O man, that thou canst sin and never reap sin's highest harvest? The Most High gave to thee a free personality, a splendid mission and a blessed destiny, but when thy heart was lifted up and thy spirit hardened thou didst sin and God has left thee to thine own ways. Thou hast introduced discord into his government. Thy selfish rebellion has separated the creature from the will of the Creator and instead of turning in affectionate adoration to God as the center of the universe, thou hast established a new center—self. Selfishness has bred lawlessness. Out of harmony with God and conscience and environment, thy soul is never at peace. It is like a troubled sea that casts up mire and dirt. "There is no peace, saith my God, to the wicked."

"Be sure your sins will find you out." Guilt has come. Liability to punishment is felt. A depraved nature holds you in bondage. Conscience, intended to be the channel of the soul's peace, is flooding with the fullness of Divine wrath until thou art made to know that the Most High still ruleth in the Kingdom of men. "And thou, O son of man, hast not humbled thy heart, though thou knewest all this, but hath praised the gods of silver and gold, of brass, iron, wood and stone, which see not nor hear

nor know. And the God in whose hand thy breath is and whose are all thy ways hast thou not glorified."

Every moral act is followed by consequences relative to its character. It bears fruit according to its kind. "Lust, when it hath conceived, bringeth forth sin, and sin when it is full-grown bringeth forth death." The natural consequences of sin, therefore, are *guilt*, desert of punishment, exposure to penalty.

Second, *depravity*. The entail of sin is a depraved condition of the whole man that vitiates the inner life.

Third, *slavery*. Paul's personification of sin as a tyrant whose chains no man can break without God's help, is expressed in the first eight chapters of Romans. This bondage must be recognized before it can be broken.

Fourth, *death* is the result of sin. Man was made for immortality. This is implied in his constitution as personal in the image of God. Christ came that he might break the power of death and that we might have life. *How shall we ever come again to the days* when men realize these things about sin and look to Jesus Christ for mercy in such deep penitence and implicit faith that they shall be converted so they will know it, and know it so they want to tell it, and tell it so they have power with God and with men, unless we can get back the swing of conquest in preaching the essential doctrines of the great salvation in terms of a knowable religion, in the glow and fervor of a Christian experience and with a consecration to the work of winning men that breaks through every crust of indifference, that tackles the hardest cases and brings them willing subjects in penitence and faith to the feet of our Lord? We did it once. Some of us have done it a hundred times. We can do it again. The world awaits that supreme demonstration that the Gospel is the power of God.

A CALM APPEAL

BENJAMIN COPELAND

Buffalo, N. Y.

To make the title plainer, longer,
And possibly a little stronger,—
A Calm Appeal to Men of Reason;
We trust not wholly out of season.

Ho! brother Fundamentalist!
And you, too, brother Modernist!
Conservative and radical,
In wrangle without terminal;—
Awhile your wordy war desist,—
Mauling each other in the mist,—
And listen to the latest word,
(Alas, alas! so long deferred,—)
Which edits up to date the thesis
Far-famed in *Origin of Species*,
(With careful, cautious variation
Of said solution of creation.)
And shows us, cocksure as the sun,
Precisely how the thing was done!

But wait a minute;—just keep cool;—
Remember you are now in school.
Forget the while, my brethren dear,
That you were e'er a pulpiteer,—
And humbly take a layman's place;
Perhaps 'twill prove a means of grace;
Queer though it feel, to be, at once,
A learned Doctor and a dunce!
A mentor in theology,—
A "kid" in anthropology!

'Tis Science speaks! attend ye, all,
Who dwell on this terrestrial ball,
And meekly own her rod and rule.
"A simple, double molecule;"—
That settles it;—as sure as sin,—
Proving the common origin,
In untold ages long ago—
A half a million years or so—
Of man and monkey, kindred dear,
And surely as first "cousin" near,—
Sharing the Simple Life together,
In every change of wind and weather.

But it is passing strange, to see,
 Developing from that same tree
 Of *moleculy* ancestry,
Such curious divergency.
 One, as in ages long since dim,
 Is swinging, still, from limb to limb;
 And promises, till Time shall fall,
 To sport his pre-historic tail:—
 In freedom, or captivity,
A monkey still, eternally!

But his near "cousin,"—what of him,
 Emerging from earth's twilight dim?
 In history we know him *man*;
 But when, or where, or how, began
 The aspiration and the will
 A loftier mission to fulfill,
 If known, alas, remains untold,
 In tree-top folk-lore, æons old.
 'Twould seem, were they so close allied
 In blood and brain, in hair and hide,
 There'll be some clue to mark the time,
 And trace the difference sublime,—
 Some hint of the diverging line,—
 Some vestige of the dream divine.
 Who will the mystery explain,
 And make the growing wonder plain?
 His upward progress through the ages;—
 His wealth of heroes, seers, and sages;—
 His lordship over every creature;
 His subjugation of great Nature,—
 Wrestling her secrets, one by one,
 And harnessing the sea, the sun!
 Achievement matching aims immense,
 Suggestive of omnipotence;—
 And, nobler far, the strife within,
 For conquest over self and sin;—
 The culture of the larger mind,
 In brotherhood with all mankind;—
 And, crowning all, through Christ's grace given,
 The grateful, holy hope of heaven.

But stay! this sounds, when all is said,
Like the Old Book our mothers read!

Somehow, the facts, with all their glory,
 Fit in with that most wondrous story
 The Bible tells, of man's creation,
 And his redemption and salvation:—

The cheer of myriads gone before,
And never, never needed more,
For joyous trust and fervent praise,
Than in these sadly darkened days.

Ah! yes;—the Book our mothers read:
Light of the living and the dead!

O ye who at God's altars serve,
Hold fast the Truth,—and never swerve;
Above all other guides preferred,
Preach ye the everlasting Word!
The glorious Gospel still proclaim
To all the world, in His dear name,
Who, in the lowly path He trod,
Disclosed the human life of God,—
And died, that all might share, above,
The bliss of his eternal love.

To Revelation it is given
To point the path that leads to heaven,
And gladden all the blessed way
That brightens to the perfect day!
But see ye that you do not fetter
The soul in bondage to the letter.

In loving God *with all the mind*
Shall each his fullest freedom find.
“*Let there be light!*” the Voice divine
Instruct thee. *God's first love be thine!*
Nor fear, that with the broadening day,
Aught that is good shall pass away.
The glory of eternal youth
Shines in the face of Christ, the Truth;
And tributary unto him
Are systems, sages, seraphim!

Give Science her full rightful field;—
Rich harvests, still, her toil shall yield;
In earth and air, in sea and sky,
New wonders wait discovery.
Co-operant with human skill,
New marvels shall attend her, still.
Her admirable zeal reward
With grateful, generous regard;—
Grant to her aims the widest scope,—
But trust not to her hands man's hope.

She cannot find out God,—nor span
The gulf which sunders brute and man.

Beyond her feeling, hearing, sight,
There is a world of life and light,
To the soul's deepest being sure,
While faith and hope and love endure.
There Spirit doth to spirit speak;
And they shall find who humbly seek.
Whate'er of mystery remain,
Eternity will make it plain;—
And, meanwhile, we shall clearly see
Christ's ever widening sovereignty.
For all things, serving his blest will,
The Father's boundless love fulfill;
And God in Christ, and Christ in man,
Shall crown, at last, creation's plan.

Rest in the Lord! He reigneth still,
And guards his cause against all ill.
The gates of Hell in vain assail;—
His Kingdom shall o'er all prevail!
This faith, this richer hope, be thine,
In peace and strength and joy divine.

EDITORIAL DEPARTMENTS

NOTES AND DISCUSSIONS

THE MYSTERY AND THE MINISTRY OF TEARS

"MAN, thou art a pendulum between a smile and a tear" (so sings Lord Byron), and the distance between them is small. Man has been called a laughing animal, and he is, but is far more characteristically a weeping animal. "Man was made to mourn." No one is exempt. Of the finest flower of our humanity it is written, "Jesus wept." Those tears of our Lord were compassionate, exemplary, consolatory tears. We do not need to know whether or not he smiled, I think he often did, but we do need to feel his kinship with our sorrow. Life begins with a cry. Someone has said of all nature: "Thy laughs are gods, thy tears are men." Is man therefore only an impersonated tear? Oliver Wendell Holmes pictures the earth as "a single great teardrop on the cheek of the Infinite," and thus lyricizes Arthur O'Shaughnessy:

If you go over desert and mountain
Far into the country of sorrow,
To-day and to-night and to-morrow,
And maybe for months and for years,
You shall come with a heart that is bursting
For trouble and toiling and thirsting,
You shall certainly come to the fountain
At length—to the Fountain of Tears.

It is an old legend of Paradise that the blossoms at the border of Eden were blackened and blighted by the blistering teardrops that fell from the eyes of the first pair as they left its beauty behind and faced the loneliness of a world of pain. How each year has swelled that flood of tears then begun and which still flows on in gathering strength to meet the sea of eternity. One of the loveliest lines in literature are those three words of Virgil: *Sunt lacrymæ rerum*, "There are tears in things." Tears are the common "wet badge of weak humanity." One thing we must believe, that tears

are earth born, mists that rise from earth and not dew that descends from heaven. We poetize when we talk of an angel weeping, as does Shakespeare or Sterne. But it is written that in their land there is "no sorrow nor crying," and of those that enter its gates, "God shall wipe away all tears from their eyes."

WHY DO WE WEEP?

Tears are easy enough to explain physically; they are very simple; ninety-nine parts water to one of salt and albumen. Yet even here they suggest a deep mystery, for they seem to be distilled directly from these very springs of vitality, the arterial blood. They are akin to that bloody sweat that mingled with the dews of Gethsemane. Whatever makes blood flow makes tears fall. When the crimson rain floods the fields of war, life distills in like currents on the mourning pillows at home.

Lorenzo, hast thou ever weighed a sigh
Or studied the philosophy of tears?
(A science still unlectured in our schools!)
Hast thou descended deep into the heart
And seen their cause? If not, descend with me
And trace these briny rivulets to their sources.

Here are a few of the springs of tears:

They arise from *pain*, all forms of it—physical suffering, mental torture, heart anguish. History is only a long story of the martyrdom of man. No man can know or even guess the secret woe of all life. The river of tears runs for the most part underground. Everywhere are graves and everywhere the sod of earth is freshened by this dewy salty rain. Tears are the blood of the wounds of the soul, the safety valves of the heart, showers blown up by the tempests of sorrow.

Tears spring also from *joy*. I marveled in my childhood to see my mother weep when she met my grandmother after many years of separation—I thought she should be glad! I understand it now. All high emotions—beauty, sublimity, awe, novelty—may touch and open the fountain of tears. The highest gladness is deeper than laughter and goes down to depths of our life where the still lakes of tears lie waiting to be stirred by the tides of

emotion. Spiritual joy has the finest and sweetest of all tears. They bathe the aching eye-ball and wash the dust of hate and wrinkles of worldly care from our cheeks.

So tears come from *sentiment*. Nearly akin to the last mentioned source are the tears caused by those vague emotions for which it is hard to find a name.

Tears, idle tears, I know not what ye mean;
Tears from the depths of some divine despair
Rise from the heart and gather in the eye,
In looking o'er the happy autumn fields
And dreaming of the days that are no more.

Pity pours forth tears. It is possible to make the sorrows of others our own. We must learn to "weep with them that weep." Such are the tears of Jeremiah, Paul and Jesus. When Jesus wept it was with two bereaved sisters. Those tears of his which were then a spring in a household, became a river in a nation and an ocean for the world. The power of sympathy is the Christ mark and there are no nobler tears than these.

Tears flow from *penitence*. These are the most precious of all that are shed—not the tears of a natural but a spiritual sorrow, for there is no real evil but sin. These tears flow at the sight of the cross of Christ. With them a woman that was a sinner washed the feet of Jesus.

Were not the sinful Mary's tears
An offering worthy heaven,
When o'er the faults of former years
She wept and was forgiven?

Said Saint Bernard: "The tears of a penitent are the wine of angels." O let us see that these shall never become the tears of mere remorse, the weeping and wailing of the outer darkness. It is better to weep on earth and laugh in heaven than to laugh on earth and weep in hell.

There are indeed *false* tears, those of hypocrisy, pride and anger. There is no promise for them and no comfort in them. It is said that a crocodile weeps when swallowing its prey. Some folks can weep at will; give them half a chance and they set the pump going. Such tears are a disease of the lachrymal glands

and not the noble offering of a noble soul on the altar of a genuine emotion.

WHAT BECOMES OF OUR TEARS?

It is claimed (not proved) that the Romans used to hang tear bottles, called lachrymatories, in the tombs, in which to preserve their tears of sorrow as an abiding tribute to the dead. But God is described by the Psalmist as having a bottle in which he gathers not his own tears but ours. Where flows the flood of tears? Let the poet answer:

But the floods of the tears meet and gather,
The sound of them all grows as thunder.
O into what bosom I wonder
Is poured the whole sorrow of years?
For eternity only seems keeping
Account of the great human weeping.
My God then, the Maker and Father,
May he find a place for the tears!

Tears are the gems that God collects and keeps in his casket of treasures. Yes, God keeps count of them even if man does forget. How sad it is to sing:

Laugh, and the world laughs with you.
Weep, and you weep alone.

We are even capable of forgetting our own joys and griefs. But God remembers and is "touched with the feeling of our infirmities." He feels more than we our pain. He sees and notes the unseen weeping of the world. He hears the sullen sobbing of the great human tide of tears and puts all in his bottle. There is an earthly sorrow for sin which wakens gladness in the heart of God, who prizes this gift from the contrite souls of earth. So sings Richard Crashaw of that weeping woman, broken-hearted by her guilt, who from those fair springs of sweet sadness, her eyes of beauty, flooded the feet of Jesus with her tears:

Angels with their bottles came
And drew from those full eyes of thine
Their Master's water, their own wine.

WHAT IS THE MINISTRY OF TEARS?

Does this sermon seem sad? I did not mean it so—I wanted

it to keep permanently to the keynote, "Blessed are they that mourn, for they shall be comforted." Carlyle rightly called Christianity a religion of sorrow, but also and because of that it is a religion of joy. There is a blessing for the eyes that weep.

Tears themselves bring relief. What is so terrible as a dry-eyed sorrow? Tears are a sign that the angel of comfort has come near the mourning heart. Tears are a safety valve for the soul.

O ye tears, O ye tears, I am thankful that ye run;
Though ye trickle in the dark ye shall glisten in the sun;
The rainbow cannot shine if the drops refuse to fall,
And the eyes that cannot weep are the saddest eyes of all.

Some time we shall find a sweetness in our bitter cup and reap at last "the far off interest of tears."

Love ye your sorrow; grief shall bring
Its own excuse in after years;
The rainbow shows how fair a thing
God can build up in tears.

Tears are humanizing. Augustine prayed, "Lord Jesus, give me the grace of tears." The power to weep shall shape at last the heart to finest ends. Tears honor those who shed them. They are not badges of humiliation but the gems of a soul's royalty, the diamonds of the mind. There may be some tears of weakness to be pitied; there are more tears of power to be admired.

There is compensation for tears, that "far-off interest" which Tennyson mentions. And probably that is what God is keeping them for in his bottle. Tears fertilize the spiritual soil out of which shall spring rich far-off harvests of the soul. Heaven makes all right. Tears, groans, sighs here are pearls, shouts, halleluiahs there. The glory piles up faster than the affliction. "They that sow in tears shall reap in joy." Angels catch up the tears of penitence and they shine in mercy's rainbow and the Saviour's crown.

What is most precious to heaven? That which they have least of—tears. Thomas Moore pictures the exiled Peri trying one by one a different gift to win readmission to her lost Paradise.

She brings a drop of a patriot's blood, a sigh of unstained love breathed by an unsullied dying maiden, and still the gates are shut. Then she offers a single tear of penitence from the cheek of a sorrowing sinner. Then cries the Peri:

Joy, joy forever, my task is done,
The gates are past and heaven is won!

CONCERNING THE COLLECTION

HERE is an ancient World Service program which was "handed down" to a certain Greek church by one who claimed to be an apostle, although he had not yet been officially recognized as one:

"With regard to the collection for the saints, you must carry out the same arrangements as I made for the churches in Galatia. On the first day of the week let each of you put aside a sum from his weekly gains, so that the money may not have to be collected when I come. On my arrival I will furnish credentials for those whom you select, and send them to convey your bounty to Jerusalem; if the sum makes it worth my while to go too they shall accompany me." 1 Cor. 16. 1-4 (Moffatt's translation).

And Paul was not only handing down a program, he was probably spoiling a sermon for some stingy souls, by discussing a collection at the end of it. What a strange anticlimax to the great resurrection argument of the fifteenth chapter! But that splendid sermon would have been a partial failure if its glorious message had not inspired just some such action. The heavenly hope helps in the performance of the earthly task. Doctrine points to duty and creed must form both character and conduct. Therefore, right in sight of the open grave of Jesus, he calls attention to the collection. To many people in our time money is a most delicate subject for pious consideration. Their joys are so seraphic that they seem always to soar above so sordid a theme. Even some advertisements of a religious gathering insert that vulgar phrase, "No collection." But God makes no apologies for talking about it in his Holy Book, nor his apostle Paul for exhorting concerning it. To be sure the church ought not to have

to discuss finance so frequently and it would not if the Christian life were conceived as necessarily involving stewardship.

1. This is a *Positive Duty*. Paul speaks with a certain authority when he says: "I have given order." There is quite as much said about giving as about praying in the Bible, and here it is Paul, the apostle of spiritual freedom, who lays down the law. All those Methodist ministers whose council is propagating a greater democracy in church government will do well to follow the teaching of this leader of liberty in that principle. Liberality is linked with liberty. It is a grace wrought by the Holy Spirit in the redeemed nature of man. It is a grace and not a burden, a right even more than a duty. It stands upon the same happy basis as singing and praying. Yet we do need some rules for singing and praying, and also for giving. And to give by rule is not a bondage to a saved soul but a religious discipline that braces and strengthens the nature.

2. It is, moreover, a *Personal Duty*. The appeal of Paul is not to a mob but to a man. He addresses not a crowd but individuals. He implores: "Let every one of you." One great evil in the church is that a very few bear its burdens. Everyone can give an offering great or small and as varied as their possessions. For gifts are various—time, talents, sympathy, service and money. The man with one talent gave the Master much trouble because he had but one and wouldn't risk that. If every single person in a congregation would help all would be interested. Ten one-dollar bills in the collection plate are a vastly larger contribution than one ten-dollar bill. How many of the four million Methodists in America subscribed to the Centenary Fund? If fifty per cent had done so, the total gift would have been doubled.

3. It is a *Duty of Partnership*. It was "for the saints." It was a beautiful act of Christian fellowship. Every religious gift should be quite as largely for others as for oneself. The benevolent budget of any church should be as big or bigger than that for current expenses. We must share the love of Jesus, whose heart was broken for all humanity. No man or church that lives for self alone can succeed or finally be saved.

4. It was a *Periodical Duty*. "Upon the first day of the

week." The money is needed regularly and should be given systematically. This condemns all those haphazard methods and claptrap schemes and devices, the special drives, the fancy fair or the oyster supper in which folks get more than they give.

That word "first" is significant in all stewardship. Under the Law the first fruits were to be offered to God—the first purple clusters of the vineyard, the first golden sheaves of the field, the first bleating lamb of the flock and the firstborn of the family. God has the first claim to our service. He is the first and preferred creditor. There are miserly souls that begin their retrenchment in hard times at the House of God. He is given the scraps and fragments of our fortunes and not his rights, which are the first, the choicest and the best.

Therefore giving being made regular is not left to impulse. Paul does not wish them to wait until he comes and then have a great mass meeting, fervid appeals and a big collection. Rather make it the steady business of life. Begin the week with this sweet grace of liberality and let it mark the Lord's Day of every week as its prime business transaction. Our first dealing should be with God and not with man.

This makes it an act of worship. That day of the resurrection, the subject of Paul's great sermon, became in the first Christian generation the day of religious assembly for the early church. It was the chief day for the appearances of the Risen Lord, the day of Pentecostal blessing, the day when Paul made his greatest missionary program at Troas, and John had his first vision on Patmos. Giving as an act of worship is quite as essential as praise and prayer, and more real in many cases. We should give most at the place and time we receive most of the Divine blessing. The collection box entered the Temple of old at God's command, and Jesus when he came to his Father's House, sat over against the treasury and watched the contributions as well as the prayers. It is an ancient law of worship: "Ye shall not come empty handed before your God." The offertory is as significant as any other part of Christian worship. Its periodical character makes it primary.

5. It is a *Pious Duty*. We are to give "as God has prospered us." A puny faith builds up a very sickly charity.

God is the sole proprietor of the universe. He alone produces all real wealth; the natural factors of production are wholly of his ordering. "He giveth the power to get wealth." We right-fully chant "All things are thine, and of thine own do we give unto thee." The silver and the gold belong to God, and the cattle upon a thousand hills. All industry has a religious background. *Laborare est orare*, "To work is to pray." Those cheap souls that hate to have business and money brought into the church feel that way simply because they have banished the thought of God from their business and their weekday work. When our homes, work-shops, factories, stores and markets cease to be temples, then do men begin to rob God. Our religion becomes a crumpled roseleaf in the family Bible and not a fragrance for every day's work.

Giving is Godlike. He is the great Giver and redemption the royal gift. We all have sung this stanza, but few of us have lived it:

Were the whole realm of nature mine,
That were a present far too small;
Love so amazing, so divine,
Demands my soul, my life, my all.

Now the whole realm of nature, that insufficient payment of which we sing, is not ours. Even the little we have is offered less freely than the majestic treasure which we don't have but sing so stoutly about. But our failure is not financial, it is spiritual.

This points to the true motive. Some give from necessity, some from honesty, some from pride and self-righteousness, some from habit—but at last we find the true inspiration in "Ye know the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, that although he was rich for your sakes he became poor." Sacrifice is the law of the Christian life. Selfishness is the very tap root of depravity. A religion that costs nothing is of little worth. It is only love's gift which will be really counted at last.

6. Giving is a *Proportionate Duty*. "Giving" is not the right word. There can be no giving to God, who is the maker and owner of all things. It is rather paying a debt proportionate to what he has placed in our possession. "The tithe is the Lord's" because it is but a separated portion of his own universal owner-

ship. It is like rent which is paid to the owner of real estate and which ought to be and generally is proportioned to property value. What we lay upon the divine altar is not only the test but in some sense the measure of our love.

There is no hard and fast rule, such as legalistic tithing. It cannot be stated in terms of arithmetic. In sacrifice a pigeon presented by the poor may be as great an offering as the bullock slain for the rich. The Christian duty therefore can only start with the tithe but dare not stop there. All we have must be at the Divine disposal if he needs it. Even the tithe system if used by Methodists to-day would banish Centenary slumps and World Service deficits. But if the Gospel rule of sacrificial stewardship were followed by the church of to-day it would be billions rather than millions of money which would be placed in the pierced hands of the King of kings for his universal conquest, and all heads, hearts and hands would be offered for his service.

"It is more blessed to give than to receive," said our Lord to his disciples. We have known the joy of receiving from his holy hands. Shall we not share with him the divine gladness of giving? When we become like him, we shall give as he gave in "Love so amazing, so divine," and it will be a fact, and not a mere song, when we sing

All the vain things that charm me most,
I sacrifice them to his blood.

Was Paul's program "handed down" to that Corinthian church? Certainly, all calls for service, our partnership with Jesus in his sacred sacrifice, his holy stewardship and his eternal intercession for lost souls and a lost world, are handed down to us from the skies.

ARE CHRISTIANS CRAZY?

PRECISELY this charge of craziness was made by a prominent Roman politician against the principal propagandist of primitive Christianity: "Paul, thou art mad! thy much learning is turning thee mad."

That scene is the meeting point of the old world and the new.

On the throne sits the representative of Imperial Rome in its glory and greatness; before him in chains stands a Paul, a feeble Jewish prisoner, on his way to execution at Rome. Yet Festus represents a decaying past and Paul the life and hope of the future. That silly saying of Festus, however, is a type of the constant judgment made by the old upon the new. As the worldly Agrippa and the pompous Festus see laid bare the intense spiritual faith of the apostle, they naturally take him for an enthusiast and a fanatic. Paul was more than once charged with madness. And why not? If he was sane, his accusers were mad, for if their worldly theory of life were correct then he was the most deluded of mortals. So they must insist on his lunacy to save their own reputations.

Are Christians crazy? The question is one for every age and especially for one like ours when things that are seen so largely control men's hearts and minds. To those so-called practical men, the seer, absorbed in spiritual verities and enthusiastic for righteousness at whatever cost to business or politics, is either a fool or a fanatic.

Surely that great apostle to the Gentiles had come through enough to make almost anyone crazy. He had committed social suicide and had flung away worldly ambitions, to follow a Crucified Carpenter. Was it not insanity to glorify the shame of a cross? Moreover, his stories of visions and voices, his great story of a resurrection and his hope of his own—how like a phantom of a diseased brain, the fanatical delusion of a brain-sick enthusiast!

Yet, so have been styled almost all of the leaders of human thought, all pioneers who lead the van of human progress. The steam engine had almost as hard a time in history as religion. Roger Bacon dreamed of it in the thirteenth century and was accused of sorcery and witchcraft. Solomon de Caus, who tried to get Cardinal Richelieu to investigate it, was called a fool for his pains and was imprisoned as a pestilent madman. The Marquis of Worcester, who experimented on this problem, was regarded as a visionary dreamer who probably had dealings with

the devil. Somewhat similar was the treatment of George Stevenson and Robert Fulton. Columbus, Galileo and all discoverers and reformers were thus regarded by the common mind. Charles Kingsley says: "There was never anyone who spoke out the truth yet upon the earth but was called a howling idiot for his pains." The crowd cried "Tom Chalveers is mad!" when he stopped preaching platitudes and began proclaiming the Gospel.

The real stupidity is that of the natural rather than the spiritual man. If a man claims to see what we cannot, what wonder we cry "Maniac!" Common sense cannot understand uncommon sense. The human is naturally as helpless before the divine as a blind man before a rainbow's glory or a deaf man when a symphony is played. Here is a phrase of a certain sort of current psychology: "Genius is a degeneration psychosis of the epileptic order!" Even a poet like Dryden could say, "Great wits to madness are near allied." Of course a prophet is frequently a man of one idea that burns into his brain and absorbs all life. "Mono-maniac!" we quite naturally call God's gifted spokesman. This is the insult the commonplace man always pays to greatness. It is the tribute of the fool to genius.

It is in religious matters that these phrases are most frequently used. Pentecost was described as drunkenness. Paul was considered mad. "Heretic, fool, fanatic, madman" are the choice Billingsgate shot at Luther and Wesley as they stood in "Shame's high pillory." The mission of Henry Carey to India was styled in the English House of Commons as the "mission of a madman," and even Sydney Smith styled those first modern missionaries as "a little detachment of lunatics."

DEMENTIA

Are Christians crazy? Is it a mania to believe, to walk by faith rather than by sight? Certainly not. Even having a false belief may be a proof of wrong reason, but that is not insanity. Insanity is a switching out of line of either the intellect, the emotions, or the will.

Take some examples as to the intellectual side of Christianity, such as the being of God. There are many powerful argu-

ments for his existence, yet should all these fail, it would not prove the believer insane. The sanest men may make mental mistakes with no disease of mind. And here the Christian stands with the greatest and wisest of the human race. The royal princes in the court of thought have always believed in God—philosophers, poets, men of science, discoverers, etc. And the Christian is most sane of all thinkers, for he makes it a practical rather than a theoretical truth. Say God to him and it is like saying “mother” to a sick child. It brings a real atmosphere of personal righteousness and puts his life in the shaping hands of his belief. The worst madness is on the other side.

The same is true of that other intellectual theory, the Divine revelation. We believe that the Father of Lights shines into men's lives by his Spirit and his Word. The question is not “Is the Bible the Word of God?” but is it insane to think that God has spoken and that not only the Scriptures but all history and life have recorded his messages to mankind. Will the Father hear us crying in the night and neither strike a light nor speak a word? Will he send no letter to his far-off child? And this supreme letter that sounds like him, which tells me about myself as he alone can, that answers my hardest questions—is not this from God? Practically it would be still greater madness not to live by his rules, and to revere and obey these tones and syllables of Almighty God.

MELANCHOLIA

There is a madness of passion, a derangement of emotion in which the floods of feeling run too high or too low. Yet all seeming excess of feeling is not madness. Feeling should be worthy of its source and in harmony with its mental basis.

An example is sin and repentance. The Christian life begins with conviction of sin and turning from sin. The Christian sees his sins in the light of the Gospel and the Cross, and so learns to hate sin as violating the harmony of the universe, intolerably offensive to a holy God, the desecrater of every sanctity and tender tie of human life. Is he crazy to hate it, to loathe it, to feel agony because of it and struggle against it? Here are two sights which

Paul seems to have beheld: the body of death hugged, kissed and petted by the sinner, and struggled with, hated and abhorred by the penitent with prayers and pleadings for deliverance. Which is the madman? And then the rapturous joy of pardon—is it madness? Who are such maniacs as those who claim that their joy has been killed by the Eighteenth Amendment! To find blessing only in a bottle or a barrel is an almost incurable insanity.

MORAL INSANITY

Is there a disease of the will, a sort of dominating moral perversion? That must be answered affirmatively, but not with the result too often asked by many modern criminologists that men be therefore acquitted of crime.

Human depravity is a sort of insanity. When we discover, as did Paul, that our sins are more than an outward act but an inward fact we do face the seeming paranoia of an irresistible state. This is not the problem of partial or of total depravity. Are Christians crazy for believing such an awful theory in any form? Yet science teaches it in the law of heredity. Lombroso and the criminologists make the world full of this sort of madmen, acting perpetually against both their highest reason and their noblest feelings.

It is easy to show that the Christian is the least crazy of all who hold this terrific theory of life. For he claims it can be cured! Is a man insane if he seeks to purge his nature? if he tries to cure his meanest madness? Indeed, it has been asserted by some psychiatrists that the first step in the remedy of lunacy is to acknowledge it! Christianity, however, gives the only scientific method—the influence of the Spirit of God. Matter is mended by matter, mind is healed by mind and spirit is saved by spirit. One cannot purge a liver with poetry or cleanse a tumor by argument. The teacher does not poultice the head of a stupid boy or give him pills to make him logical. Physical remedies for the body, facts and arguments for the intellect, grandeur to the imagination, and beauty to the æsthetic taste—but none of these can make a depraved soul holy—not all that science has discovered or poetry dreamed. An unholy spirit must be submitted to the

Holy Spirit. That divine agency will bring the Great Physician into the soul.

What would have happened if the world had taken Festus rather than Paul for the sane man? Fortunately the madness of Paul has played a bigger part in history than the sense of Festus. That alleged madness turned the tides of time and is still slowly but surely revolutionizing the world. How does our mind measure such varied souls to-day? the one with his doubts and denials, the other with his force of conviction and his power to endure; the one a self-indulgent weakling, dawdling on the lap of luxury, the other with sublime self-sacrifice and splendid heroism, whose foolscap history has changed to a crown.

It would be madness to say "Our Father" and live like orphans, to recognize revelation and neglect its message, to confess sin and repent not, to recognize Jesus and not let him save, to confess the Holy Spirit and refuse his sanctification. The worst madness is to let our conduct cross our convictions.

Better be mad! "Whom God deceives is well deceived." If such glorious things as Christianity has brought us are dreams, then let us dream on and never wake. If it is madness to have the fruits of the Spirit, to live a holy and heroic life and to die peacefully—then, be mad! Such a view as that turns sanity into insignificance and contempt and madness into grandeur and glory. It finds in madness light and rapture, in sanity gloom and despair. Better be a good, strong, consistent, happy, triumphant, earth-conquering, heaven-winning Christian than a weak, wicked, wavering, miserable, cowardly sinner. Who really is crazy, the Christian or that cockatrice that like all real lunatics thinks himself sane?

A romantic writer of to-day, Lord Dunsany, asks, "Who knows of madness whether it is divine or whether it be of the pit?" And thus much can we answer his query: He who denies the divine is a Bedlamite on his way to the pit.

GEORGE MACDONALD

ONE hundred years ago there was born in Scotland this preacher, poet and novelist. This note is written not to furnish any sketch of his long and noble life and its rich literary products, but simply to call attention to a striking feature of his religious teaching.

The God who is a living character in almost all his works is not the metaphysical Deity whose so-called natural attributes have so perverted theology and rationalized religion. He was in closest fellowship with the God of the Bible, that God who is pictured with sensibilities even more fully than the portrayal of his intellect and will. Man was made in the image of God and therefore we may be confident that we can find a sympathetic humanity in God.

Everyone will remember that epitaph which Macdonald records as on the grave of an ancestor of the hero of his first novel, *David Elginbrod*:

Here lie I, Martin Elginbrod;
Have mercy on my soul, Lord God,
As I wad do, were I Lord God
And ye were Martin Elginbrod.

That is a most daring indictment (by implication) of that type of Deity so often presented in many theologies and accepted by mistaken religionists.

Still more striking and far more lovely is that religious lyric, "The Hurt of God," in which he discloses the God whose partnership with his universe makes him a common sharer of its sorrow. That is the God who can be seen most fully in the sacrificial life and death of his Only Son.

O the hurt and the hurt and the hurt of love;
Wherever sun shines and the waters flow,
It hurts the snowdrop, it hurts the dove,
God on his throne and man below.

For sun could not shine nor waters flow,
Snowdrop blossom nor sweet dove moan,
God be in heaven nor man below,
But for love with its sorrowful hurt alone,

Thou knowest, O Savior, the depth of its sorrow,
Did'st measure its joy in the might of thy pain;
Lord of all yesterdays, days and tomorrow,
Help us love on in the hope of thy gain.

Hurt though it may, love on, love forever,
Love for love's sake like the Father above;
But for whose brave-hearted Son we had never
Known the sweet hurt of the sorrowful love.

He was able to see in the Incarnation this revelation of the Eternal Heart when he sings thus of "That Holy Thing":

They all were looking for a king
To slay their foes and lift them high;
Thou cam'st, a little baby thing,
That made a woman cry.

George Macdonald may not be given a place in the highest rank of poets and novelists, but his work has a worth for spiritual inspiration as well as for culture which lifts his art high above the indecent decadency of much present-day literature. And his books are broad in their tolerance and entertaining in their humor.

No nobler hymn has been written in our own generation than Frank Mason North's "Where cross the crowded ways of life"—one that will not escape from church hymnals for many generations to come. And we will feel compelled to sing that song again and again as we read the following poem as to saving the city written years ago by George Macdonald:

I said: "Let me walk in the fields."
He said: "No, walk in the town."
I said: "There are no flowers there."
He said: "No flowers, but a crown."

I said: "But the skies are black;
There is nothing but noise and din."
And he wept as he sent me back—
"There is more," he said; "there is sin."

I said: "But the air is thick,
And fogs are veiling the sun."
He answered: "Yet souls are sick,
And souls in the dark undone!"

I said: "I shall miss the light,
And friends will miss me, they say."
He answered: "Choose to-night
If I am to miss you or they."

I pleaded for time to be given.
He said: "Is it hard to decide?
It will not seem so hard in heaven
To have followed the steps of your Guide."

I cast one look at the fields,
Then set my face to the town;
He said, "My child, do you yield?
Will you leave the flowers for the crown?"

Then into his hand went mine;
And into my heart came he;
And I walk in a light divine,
The path I had feared to see.

Macdonald's father was a farmer, a direct descendant of a family that suffered severely in the horrid massacre of Glencoe. Most of his life, however, was lived in London. Surely he loved the country and would have as earnestly pleaded for the rural work of the church—but, sharing the sacrificial spirit of the Saviour, he learned to love something less lovely, and like Frank Mason North,

In haunts of wretchedness and need,
On shadowed thresholds dark with fears,
From paths where hide the lures of greed
We catch the vision of thy tears.

May we not hope that the Christian pulpit of this century may learn to lay aside the coldness of merely abstract truths and present a Living God, whose throbbing heart of love stirs us even more than the sublimest vision of his power?

THE HOUSE OF THE INTERPRETER

In this issue we are completing the Biblical Studies of the city problem. Much has necessarily been omitted, but those who have followed these discussions will have come to see that the city is used as a striking symbol of the best and the worst in human life from the first to the last book of the Bible. The city of Cain, Babel, the Canaanite towns, Sodom and Gomorah, Babylon, the old and the New Jerusalem, Zion, City of God

—all these are parallels, both of likeness and opposition. In future numbers of the *REVIEW*, special attention will be paid to the missionary message of Holy Scripture.

THE HOLY CITY

Lesson: Revelation 21

That first city, the city of Cain, is both a past and a present city. The city built upon hate and selfishness still lives. The city of Christ also is a present city and is growing. The city of Cain some day shall go down like Babylon. The city of Christ shall come down and fill the whole earth. Of course the story of humankind in the Bible does not begin with the city at all. It begins with a garden. It is a rural picture. It is interesting to note that the last chapter in the Bible recalls the first chapter. It describes a city in which all the beauty, freshness and health of the country is pictured and united with the wealth and art of the city, and that is the New Jerusalem. When some day we shall have a city that has the health, life and promise of rural life and will also be intellectual and artistic, that will be the City of God. It hasn't come as yet, not even in New York. One wonders if the twentieth century will realize a city that has got rid of dust, smoke, noise, crime, poverty, misery, and the slums. Thank God, some of the wet spots of urban life are drying up and the river of rum is giving way to the clear and crystal River of Life. The City of God is coming, but do not think that this Holy City that John saw is an actual material town. It is with us here and now if we open our eyes to behold it. Right beside our visible buildings are rising the towers and pinnacles of that spiritual city, but our duty is to bring this ideal into our actual cities and rebuild them after the pattern of the City of God.

The psalmists sang about it; the prophets preached it; John saw it. Shall we accept it and try to translate that vision of the Apocalypse into a great, glorious, living reality? Shall that Christianity of ours, which has already won the best, also conquer the worst and bring into reality that vision of the new heaven and the new earth based on righteousness?

We must notice that that Holy City comes down—the evil city came up. Babylon, that harlot city that John also saw, came out of the abyss. There is here no space to explain what that certainly means. Our Pre-millennial friends don't understand the symbolism of the Apocalyptic. Apocalyptic symbolism is based on Babylonian cosmogony, which sees in the sea an unconquered chaos out of which come the infernal powers that oppose the God of order and goodness. The beasts are there and Daniel sees them come up out of the sea, and Daniel sees also the Son of Man coming in the clouds of heaven. Do you think in the book of Daniel, where you see Greece, Persia, and all the other nations hostile to the kingdom of God coming as beasts out of the sea, that those nations did literally come up out of the sea, and do you think the Son of Man will literally come in the clouds? No, it is symbolism. The sea types the natural chaos of rebellion against God; the clouds symbolize the spiritual realm. Out of that same sea where Daniel sees the beastly

nations of Babylonia, Greece, Persia, and all the rest rising, John beheld that wicked city of Babylon (Rome unquestionably is meant), the harlot city, clothed in scarlet riding on the Beast. The New Jerusalem coming down from heaven is not a harlot city but a bride. Rome is wedded to the Beast; the Holy City to the spotless Lamb. The harlot city is clothed in garments of scarlet because her robes are dyed with the blood of suffering, pain, cruelty, war, and hate. The Holy City is clothed with white raiment which is the righteousness of the saints.

They are both adorned, one with the jewels of wicked wealth, and the other with the gems of spiritual beauty, as a bride for her husband. Surely we need not look forward for that city. That is one trouble with all Premillennial interpretations? It is well that we don't have to have worthless interpretation that sees in prophecy something which is going to happen bye and bye. The Bible is a guide that is good for all time, and when we get rid of literalistic "fundamentalism" and find the "one foundation," we will have a living book for it. It is here and now. "And He that sits on the throne says, Behold, I *am making* all things new." The Eternal God speaks in the present tense. He is on the job now and we are to work with him. He takes the old material to build with; the old earth, the old civilization, and the old humanity, and just as he regenerates sinful human souls, he is rebuilding the world and human society.

"I am making all things new." Our big business is simply to take earthly things and with the help of the power that comes down from above transform them into heavenly things. Not to build the Babel with which men have tried to reach the skies and which has rent humanity into factions, but take Pentecost that comes down, a Pentecost that unites into one speech, one language, one heart and one mind, the people of all lands and all nations.

The city is foursquare. That idea of foursquareness is of course an ideal. Those of us who study the mystic language of the Apocalypse know that all the numbers have symbolic meanings. Three is the heavenly and four is the earthly number. That city foursquare with three gates on each side means an earthly city filled with heavenly inspiration. And the beauty of this New Jerusalem is that it is not simply a square, but a cube; it is not merely a two-dimensional arrangement, it has three dimensions. It is as high as it is long and broad. The city of God is the city where all humanity and all human interests meet. Let us think of it this way—from the East come the memory and tradition of the past; from the West progress and forward-looking adventure of the future; from the North philosophy and wisdom, and from the South emotion and passion, while from above descends the love and might of God. All things come and meet in the Holy City, which is the City of God.

In this story of the Holy City we also have a vision of its individual and social values. This is expressed perfectly in one phrase. The angel who was assisting in the architecture of that town had a golden reed with which he measured its dimensions. That golden reed goes back to the vision of Ezekiel, where he sees restored Jerusalem after the

captivity. The interesting phrase, the one which grips stronger than any phrase in this whole picture, says that it was high, and long, and broad, "according to the measure of a man." What does it all mean? Just this, that the City of God is both a corporate perfection and an individual perfection. It is both human and material. If we think of the city simply as a material institution we haven't the right idea of the city. The City of God is a human city in which man is the mansion, man the palace, and man the glory. And so society and individualism both come together in that vision of the City of God, and a social gospel and a personal gospel are united in that divine revelation.

Here we approach what is even more wonderful spiritually, and that is this passage, "There is no temple therein," and that other statement that the "Lamb is the light thereof." Bishop McConnell preached a sermon on that text, "The Lamb is the light thereof." The Lamb is the Lamb that was slain. What is it that gives the light in the City of God? It is the burning altar of sacrifice, pictured by the wounded Lamb, that gives the light. We will never kindle any glory in the town we live in unless we go to it in the spirit of sacrifice and service. The slain Lamb is the light of the Holy City that comes down from Heaven, and there is no temple therein. When shall the Church of God understand that it is not merely services, but service, that counts? The loftiest worship of God is found in the lowly service of mankind. No temples! what does that mean? Surely it signifies that by and by we will have to knock out the walls of the church so that we can get everything inside. We must get the shops, the stores, the factories, and the voting booths and the city halls inside. Would it not be fine if we could get Congress, City Councils, and the courts inside the City of God! If we could just shove out the walls of God's temple and bring them within, the entire City would be a Temple. Every banker's desk, every merchant's counter, and every kitchen table would be an altar, where the priests of humanity are making their sacrificial service of love to mankind. We would have music but it would not be merely the music of choir and quartet, it would be the music of manual toil, the liturgy of labor, and all life would become worship, every meal a sacrament and every word a benediction. Even our election days would become sacred feasts to which voters should come up once or twice a year, as the people came up to Jerusalem.

All work and all business should catch the dream and even our churches, for they need the vision too. It will come down upon us and then the whole earth will become the foundation of the divine city where all men are God's priests, where eating and drinking and work and worship are constant sacrifice to the God of all power and righteousness.

THE ARENA

WHAT THE RURAL CHURCH MAY LEARN OF THE CALIFORNIA MISSIONS

THE Christian churches of to-day, of whatever denomination, have a high tradition to be worthy of, in rural work. The American country church is fortunate to have in its midst such striking monuments of the rural work of the past as the missions of California. Europe indeed has few more noteworthy, for the reclaiming genius of the great religious orders found no such scope for action and achievement there as they did in the New World.

The score of agricultural mission settlements with which Father Serra and his Franciscan successors occupied and developed many sorts of rural areas and pioneered that great State are worthy memorials of the great mediæval tradition and may well be an inspiration to large and high conception on the part of rural church leaders to-day.

The rural work of the mediæval Catholic Church and of its great Orders has unfortunately been obscured by emphasis upon the ecclesiastical and theological and ascetic aspects. The foundations did indeed represent an endeavor to escape from the "world" into isolation and solitude for a communion and walk with God, but also for a more simple, real, fruitful, and godly life. The great majority of these establishments could be called rural, for they most commonly sought out the untouched and unreclaimed places, far from the artificialities of the world's cities, and very often made such deserts blossom like the rose and industry to thrive. This is the positive side of monasticism. They were reclaimers and builders. Even an Order of such apparently negative ideals as the Carthusians has left to this day such an achievement as Le Grande Chartreuse.

There is a large suggestion in their work for the statesmen of rural Christianity. For rural areas of special difficulty need settlements just as corresponding areas in the cities do.

There is not now in the Christian world anything approaching in scope of plan or excellency of execution the constructions and activities of our California missions as they once were.

Rural and agricultural progress is surely possible, and achievements for rural Christianity at least conceivable, on a wholly different scale than now obtains, if primitive nomads, roaming over the desert and mountain region between the Lower Colorado and the Pacific, could be led to become agriculturalists and industrial workers of no mean merits and be largely responsible for rearing those magnificent mission settlements which are the pride and glory of old California.

For from the wilderness in the space of little more than a generation they arose, grew, and flourished. Helen Hunt Jackson—in her "Ramona,"—and others have inspired a restoration of what remained from their ruin and neglect, and to governmental attempts to reclaim the thousands of Indians whom they had formerly civilized. But there is no spirit or

genius of this day to restore up to the standards of the past, and the best efforts of modern paternal reservations and education produce but a sorry result by comparison. They do at least however, inspire with respect for the church of the past and for the agricultural and rural achievements of the missions.

Father Serra—whose clerical name was the Franciscan one of "Junipero"—was an able upholder of the tradition of the great Saint Francis. Before he died in 1784 he had planned, located, and founded nearly half of the score of missions. His last act of life was to walk to the door of his abode in San Carlos in order that he might look again upon the beautiful face of nature as he learned to love it in this land of magnificent panoramas. He located his missions like a general. As a builder of rural churches and as an organizer of agricultural missions it would perhaps be impossible to find his equal on record. And this whether the standard of judgment be material or spiritual. He and his followers could never be accused of making the latter secondary in their great zeal for the former.

The mission churches—as anyone who knows California has seen—were veritable rural cathedrals. They represent an *infinitude* of care and patience and work and love. Hence they are truly places of worship and houses of God. They were created by the reverent genius of Christian men in the wilderness. Everything about them is well and beautifully done—they are works of love and of pride, and on no mean scale. In location and general surroundings they are ideal—fitfully commanding the surrounding countryside.

One finds them in the midst of every sort of agricultural province and resource; on the shore slopes, in the mountain valleys, and—as at La Soledad—in the wide valley pastures.

They had outposts known as *Asistencias* or *visitas* served by priests from the mission, and surrounding them for many leagues were the *rancherias* of the population. But the mission was the life-center of spiritual and material things. For beside the church and the missionary house, there were the buildings and equipment of a complete agricultural and industrial Institutional Church. There were school, shops, orchard, gardens, reservoirs, wells, corrals, fields, pastures. There were grave yards. Irrigation works, where necessary, were of the best standards of the day and of great engineering skill. The missions initiated many phases of the agriculture and horticulture that have since made California famous. Their industrial products were very considerable.

For the policy of the missions was to get down to fundamentals. They taught their people *better living* while at the same time they inculcated the elements, as they knew them, of the *Christian religion*. Their achievements in raising the general level of life around them were little short of marvelous. Secular governmental action to-day can show no such results.

Perhaps after all there was wisdom in allowing the Christian Church to be an essential and indeed commanding part of the scheme of colonization. The great handicaps which rural life in the Mississippi

Valley has worked under for a century, because of the solely material considerations represented in the original survey of 1785, have put a drag upon social and community life—except for schools—which rural America will be long in overcoming.

Even their road-planning—the Camino Real—stretching from Guatemala to Monterey, and connecting the missions, was excellent in conception, but necessarily imperfect in detailed execution, under pioneering conditions. It is appreciated even to-day in this era of great trunk highways.

But in all the establishments the Church came first. The cross was raised, and bells hung, and service done before anything else was attempted in the region. The bells were an essential feature, and those well-known ones of the San Gabriel belfry, have in them a suggestion for the spiritualization of the countryside that our matter-of-fact rural churches would do well to heed. The missions were named for saints, that the lives within and around them might be reminded to attempt sublimity of Christian character, and make a psalm of life.

Their registers and record books—even after the lapse of a century—would put to shame those of almost any rural church. Their human accounting, of births, deaths, baptism and marriages, and of other sacramental acts were recorded with as much care as we keep financial accounts.

Their president priests remained at their tasks of spiritual inspiration and constructive leadership for in some cases forty years.

A few of these missions are now again in use. But the truest preservation and restoration that could occur would be the recognition and acceptance of the genius of their achievements for rural Christianity.

There can be no doubt that despite all difference of time, place, and conceptions of Christian work, the rural church of America has much to learn from these relics of a very old and high tradition in the general uplift and evangelization of a countryside.

Northwestern University.

WILLIAM L. BAILEY.

JESUS CHRIST AND THE HUMAN QUEST—A CRITICISM

Jesus Christ and the Human Quest is the title of a new book which discusses in a most novel way the great Christian truths of Christ's person and redemption. It is by Professor Edwin Lewis, who holds the chair of Systematic Theology in Drew Seminary.

The book is in many ways a commendable piece of work. We are not able, however, to write a thorough criticism with a balanced expression of appreciation and objection, because of the limits set by the REVIEW for this article. Because of this circumstance and also because a favorable review has already appeared from the pen of Professor Rall, we will turn immediately to a direct statement in the briefest possible form of our chief objections to Professor Lewis' views. In three or four

¹*Jesus Christ and the Human Quest*. By Edwin Lewis. New York and Cincinnati: The Abingdon Press.

instances we will undertake to give in some detail the reasons for our objections.

1. Professor Lewis has no real Incarnation. He denies true God-head to Jesus.

2. He criticizes the familiar Christology because it makes necessary a time process in the life of God. The interesting thing about this criticism is that Professor Lewis' own theory does exactly the same thing. The truth is, of course, that our human intelligences cannot think the relation of the Infinite to the finite in any respect. Any doctrine of the Incarnation and any doctrine of creation would be equally open to this criticism.

3. He criticizes the familiar Christology as making Jesus an automaton, and even as playing into the hands of materialistic evolution.

4. He takes an indefinite and mediating attitude upon the Virgin Birth. His position does violence to the New Testament facts. As mediating, his interpretation cannot be scientific.

5. Having denied a real Incarnation, which at once secures and explains the uniqueness of Jesus, he undertakes to secure and explain this Christian fact on other grounds. His effort seems wholly to fail. Since for him Jesus is only a somewhat superior human being who achieved Christ-hood, there is no reason why he should not be frequently reproduced, and the author, though he tries desperately, does not succeed in making one out.

6. His idea of the universality of Christ is meager when stood beside the New Testament doctrine. For him Christ is universal simply as the eternal ideal of what God means by man. For the New Testament Christ is universal also because he achieved a universal salvation, which is complete for all men in him.

7. His treatment of sin and punishment misses the deeper moral truths involved in these ideas.

8. His doctrine of the Cross repudiates just what is most characteristic and precious in this great New Testament truth.

9. His basis for Christian fellowship is latitudinarian, and in being so ignores the wisdom of all the Christian centuries.

Having thus in hasty summary set forth our major objections to Professor Lewis' views, we want now to venture a few details of criticism.

Our first criticism is the most important. We object to his doctrine of Christ's person. He denies God-head to Jesus. His position is stated with perfect clearness again and again. Jesus is not an eternal divine personality, the Second Person of the glorious Trinity, who took human nature and flesh in the womb of the Virgin; instead he is a man as we are who achieved progressively, and at death completely, a divine consciousness. Jesus made increase toward this final consummation throughout his life. In his closing moments, he at last fully seized the mind of God, God seized him, and the work was done. He had achieved a complete divine consciousness. God had achieved a complete self-expression under human conditions.

For Professor Lewis Christ is divine only in the sense that with God's help he achieved a perfect expression of God's innermost motive and thought. He is eternal only in the sense that the truth about God which came to expression in him is eternal. Thus Lewis says, "There is no proper sense in which the Babe who lay in the arms of Mary and to whom was given the name of Jesus, was at the same time also the Christ." Again he says, "The Son of God was not the little Lad who played in the streets of Nazareth, but the despised and rejected Man of Sorrows." He notes the necessity of a distinction between Jesus and Christ, and says, "He does not cease to be Jesus the Son of Mary because he has become 'The Christ of God.'"

He specifically rejects the idea of Incarnation, which "involves an instantaneous and complete transfer by conception of a separate divine self-consciousness to human conditions," as unsupported in a sound Scripture exegesis, as psychologically inconceivable, and as philosophically impossible. The detail of his criticism we will come to later; but his statements above make it perfectly clear that Professor Lewis repudiates in its entirety that which the Christian Church has unanimously believed and maintained, namely, that the eternal personal Son of God took human nature and flesh in the womb of the Virgin; that personal God became man.

The quotations we have made are from pages 318-320, but the position runs clear through his book. Jesus achieves moral goodness (96); Jesus was Son of God because he achieved something (102); the metaphysics of the Church's creeds is impossible, all we need is to see in Jesus one who absolutely manifested God's sacrificial love (114). The one absolutely perfect human life is, by virtue of that perfection, God manifest in the flesh (295); God chose Jesus as his instrument (321); All creation involves a degree of Incarnation, and the One True Life bespeaks it also, only more fully (525); The eternal value which he calls Logos, Christ, and Eternal Son is not an eternal personal self-consciousness, but the eternal motive and consciousness of God at last revealed in the man Jesus (342).

Do we need to point out that this human Jesus cannot possibly stand to Christian faith as the equivalent of the strong Son of God of the creeds? Fine language used about him cannot hide from Christian hearts the reduced size of Professor Lewis' Jesus. In much of his thought and teaching he was a child of his age (109-111); and to the last, in spite of the fine phrase "Progressive" Incarnation, he was never anything more than an extraordinarily empowered human life, through whom God finally succeeded in getting himself into complete expression (332). To such a human figure one cannot pray, for he has not omniscience. In such a human figure one cannot trust, for he has not omnipotence. The death of such a human figure can have no abiding significance for humanity. Indeed, it may be questioned whether proud, self-sufficient human reason would accept permanently even the moral leadership of such a figure. Professor Lewis has tried to reinterpret the Incarnation under the modern category of progress. He has tried to pre-

serve every great Christian value. We would like to feel that he has succeeded. But we are compelled to conclude the opposite. Professor Lewis' Christ, when men have meditated upon him sufficiently to have evaluated him, will be acceptable to no one. He will not satisfy "modern" men, whom Lewis seeks to please, for he is a supernatural figure. He will not satisfy Christian faith, for he is not God. Professor Lewis has sacrificed the Theanthropic Person and offered to faith a much more difficult and much less valuable figure.

A word as to our third item of criticism: his statement that the familiar Christology makes Jesus an automaton, and that it plays into the hands of materialistic evolution. What Lewis means is that we could have no advance certainty that Jesus' life would stand unflatteringly good without making of him an automaton, and without regarding his character as completely determined in every detail by the material ovum in Mary's womb. We take time only to reply that there can be moral certainty without metaphysical necessity, and that for Christian faith the material ovum had as little to do with the moral choices and sonship of Jesus as the pre-natal broodings of the Virgin. The character of the eternal Son of God came to expression in and through human nature, and that character determined the eventuations of Jesus' history. (See his book, 96, 99, 101, 281, 284, 308, 310.)

We skip now to our seventh criticism: That Professor Lewis has missed the deeper truths involved in his discussion both of sin and punishment. An adequate statement of this criticism would take considerable space. We have room only for a paragraph. Professor Lewis sees sin as false choice. He has a fine grasp, also, upon its more evident social consequences: sin as an influence for evil, and as a cause of suffering. There is, however, a third fact about sin which he has missed, and it is of supreme significance for the biblical point of view. It is the fact that sin anywhere within the human race immediately involves all men of the race everywhere in moral evil. We are not thinking of Adam's federal headship, or that all souls were contained in him, or anything of the kind. The analogy is organism, affected in its whole being by the disease of a single part. Precisely similar is the moral organism of the human race. Sin in any one member of society involves the whole body. A human life can be ideal only when it is surrounded with ideal lives. A mother can be an ideal mother only to an ideal child. She may be a good mother to a bad child; but evil in the child forces the abnormal, the unideal into motherhood. Careful thinking will discover that this runs through all human relations, and makes moral evil a universal consequence of the first act of human sin. "By one man sin entered the world."

Against the background of this awful involvement of the single false choice stands out the New Testament truth of God's moral wrath, a truth deeply witnessed in the universal moral consciousness of the race. Lewis, following Bowne, has missed this, and with it has lost a value that is fundamental to the Christian conception of Redemption. He appreciates the physical consequences of sin, and in part their social consequences,

he appreciates also the remedial value of punishment; but he misses the idea of guilt with its involvement of ill-desert, to which corresponds punishment as judgment.

Eighth, his doctrine of the Cross repudiates just what is most characteristic and precious in this great New Testament truth. This failure is a natural consequence of his weakened position on sin and punishment. True he speaks of Christ as Redeemer, and of his work as Redemption, but these words, in his usage, have no meaning beyond a certain moral influence. The value of the cross is entirely in its effect upon men. It has no effect upon God. God values it only because it meets the revelational needs of men (179).

He says, Jesus forgave for repentance alone, and seeing the inference of his statement he goes on to ask: "Why did Christ need to come at all? Why his suffering and death?—If the conditions of forgiveness are the same now as they were before Calvary or even before Bethlehem, why a Divine Incarnation?" (178). This question is inevitable and every one who reads his book will ask it. Professor Lewis has an answer, but it is, from the standpoint of the New Testament, revolutionary. He says the reason for the Incarnation and the Cross is man's need for adequate knowledge. Man can repent only when he has seen clearly the nature of his fault. This is revealed in the cross, and so the cross by showing sin against the background of God's grace and purpose makes possible repentance and is thus an Atonement. Professor Lewis is explicit at this point. He says: "When man repents God forgives. At all times and in all places that has been true. But God cannot forgive beyond the range of repentance. To induce an adequate repentance is therefore God's problem" (179). He defines justification by faith as "forgiveness and restoration proportioned to the degree of repentance" (180). He rejects both the idea of penal substitution and of governmental necessity as interpretive of the cross. He seems to know of no other conception providing an objective value for God in the cross save these two, and says that anything beyond his own view is a mysterious plus so vague that few can agree upon it and so unessential that agreement or disagreement has no bearing upon the personal experience of forgiveness (181).

Here again Professor Lewis is thoroughly revolutionary. He parts company with the New Testament, with the almost unanimous consciousness of the Christian centuries, and with the exact definitions of his own Church. The Christian Church has doubtless found every value he names in the Cross: but beyond them all and before them all the Cross is something that Christ does for God, something that all of God does within his own life to meet the guilt of sin, and to make forgiveness possible.

Finally, we would call attention to his latitudinarian position in respect of Church standards. He objects to the Church requiring belief in a particular view of Christ's person as necessary to Christian fellowship, and asserts that it is enough to insist that men shall recognize his complete moral and spiritual lordship. "Any man," he says, "who recognizes and exhibits that lordship is a Christian." He continues, "If we can

get men wholly committed to the service of Jesus Christ, 'testing their lives by his,' all the related intellectual questions may safely be left for the free consideration of Christian intelligence" (21).

We reply that this is not the basis in any effective branch of the Christian Church, nor has it been the attitude of the Church in any effective period of its history. The periods of doctrinal indefiniteness have been periods of spiritual decline and impotency. The periods of spiritual advance have been periods of doctrinal definiteness, and its agents have been men of clear and positive conviction. In the first century Paul's gospel triumphed everywhere, and the Ebionite position, which was more like Modernism, failed. The German Reformation was at once a tremendous doctrinal polemic and a tremendous spiritual revival. The same is true of the Wesleyan revival: it was controversial, dogmatic. No one can think that Mr. Wesley was latitudinarian except one who has not read him; and Professor Lewis would never have quoted the familiar passage about, "Is thy heart right, as my heart is with thy heart? If it be, give me thy hand" (275), if he had read the sermon he has quoted. Unitarianism is the typical illustration of the latitudinarian position, and its declining membership and failure to develop missions is a sufficient demonstration of the ineffectiveness of this basis for church organization. The unity of the body of Christ has never been what he asserts, "the free surrender to a common purpose of service and love" (21). On the contrary it has always been precisely what he denies, namely, a definite body of belief about God and Christ and salvation, a body of belief that has stood as the basis for an act of self-entrusting, and that has thus become fruitful in manifold love and service.

It is doubtless true that the moral equivalent of faith in the Christian view of God and Christ and salvation may sometimes be achieved on the basis of erroneous opinions; but the ineffectiveness of loose religious opinions is too apparent in history to warrant the Church's surrendering its standards of belief to make room for these occasional figures. The great churches all have standards of belief in one form or another, and the Church unity Professor Lewis describes has no existence in fact. Methodism has its Articles and its Standard Sermons. Presbyterianism has its Confession. The Episcopalians, the Lutherans, the Reformed have all their confessions and catechisms, and even the Baptists have a well established consensus of belief that is practically binding. The Christian basis that Professor Lewis has described is one that has no existence save in his own desires, and in one or two ineffective organizations. The Church that has spread and conquered and blessed and uplifted the world has been a Church with a definite body of belief and one that has dared to enforce that body of belief upon all who have sought to exercise its teaching offices, or to share the inner sanctities of its fellowship. Jesus gave that body of belief to Peter and John. Paul received it from these first apostles and handed it on. Polycarp, Papias and Ignatius received it in turn. And wherever you touch it, it is, in main outline, the same. Paul in Romans, Peter in the Acts and in his

First Epistle, Ignatius in his authentic letters, Justin Martyr in his apology, they all hold and teach one body of belief. During the first half of the second century the Apostles' Creed was in use. In the last half Irenæus has a different creed, but the same body of belief. Tertullian and Origen came in order. There are verbal differences, but the same faith. Such was the Church of those martyr centuries, a Church whose victory was faith; and it was because of the sublimity of its faith that it was able to dare paganism's fire and sword, and that it conquered. Within this Church and for this faith we too will gladly dare and suffer; nor have we any doubt that when the dust of the age has blown away, the Faith of the Ages with that same strong Son of God as its center will still stand, unhurt, unblemished, surrounded by a glory undimmed.

HAROLD PAUL SLOAN.

Haddonfield, N. J.

[AN EDITORIAL EXPLANATION.—It is not my purpose to discuss controversially the issues presented in this criticism of that very valuable theological work of Doctor Lewis. If it had been a distinct charge of heresy against that distinguished theologian, of course it could not have been used in the *METHODIST REVIEW*. To make such charges otherwise than by legal action is a violation of ethical principles.

Methodists may widely differ in their Christological methods, just as Adam Clark did from Joseph Benson. From the standpoint of the more pragmatic modern epistemology, it certainly is not a denial of the Deity of Jesus Christ to see his consciousness of that relationship a progressive element in his life. In the denial of that fact some speculative Christologists have actually ignored the real revelation of his personality as related in the New Testament. To-day there are some of us who are sufficiently delivered from Greek Absolutism to find no distinction between value-judgments and existential judgments. If Doctor Sloan and Professor Lewis both find God in Jesus Christ by differing intellectual methods, surely we should let each of them "gang his ain gait," if they but live in fellowship with the Living Saviour of the world.

As to their varying views on the Atonement, I myself firmly believe in an objective element in the Atonement as well as in the moral influence of the Cross of Christ. There is an eternal background of Redemption in the nature of God. Indeed, the time has come in religious thought when there is no reason to reject that Patripassianism which used to be regarded as heterodox. But that Divine satisfaction which is the basis of the pardon of sins is an ethical process and not such a judicial fiction as is expressed in those unscriptural and indeed utterly repulsive theories as the so-called "penal substitution." Doctor Lewis may have confined too narrowly the Divine pardon to a purely human act of repentance inspired by the moral influence of the sacrificial love of Jesus. But it is just as narrow to see in justification only a forensic act. The righteousness of faith is more than a legal fiction; it is a real sharing by mystic union the Divine attribute of

holiness. Therefore a moral-influence theory of the Atonement, while utterly incomplete as to its source, has greater practical value than many of the so-called governmental theories.

Indeed, ought not the Christianity of to-day learn again that the Sermon on the Mount, that constitution of the Kingdom of God, is a spiritualization of morals which must be the essence of religious experience and life? Confessional theology has largely ignored the teaching of Jesus. It says little or nothing about the Kingdom of God and pays little attention to personal piety. We Methodists will be glad to accept within our fellowship all Fundamentalists who do not ask folks to be saved by merely accepting verbal formulas and all Modernists who do not preach mere negations but call sinners to repentance and to trust in a present Christ.

Thoughtful people find little worth in books which simply endorse their opinions or echo their prejudices. Therefore I advise all our ministry and sufficiently well educated laity to read such remarkable books as Bishop Temple's *Christ, the Truth*, which follows quite closely the pathway of traditional Christology, and this much praised and criticized treatise of Edwin Lewis, which finds the same Lord by the road of a Human Quest.—G. E.]

BIBLICAL RESEARCH

THE PARTHENOGENETIC PROBLEM OF CHRISTIANITY

OUR strictly Biblical Research as to the historic reality of the miraculous birth of Jesus is necessarily, but by no means exhaustively, ended. It began, as our readers will remember, with a criticism of the so-called Argument from Silence, so often used by the opponents of the reality of the Virgin Birth. It will close with a brief discussion of the current beliefs on this problem in the second Christian century, which is a strong secondary sort of evidence that those three New Testament authorities, Peter,¹ Paul and John, whose silence is asserted, while they may not have recorded this view of the birth of Christ in their writings for reasons already pointed out, did, nevertheless, almost certainly hand it down as a traditional testimony of the Apostolic Age.

THE APOSTOLIC INHERITANCE OF THE SECOND CENTURY

In the Apostolic Age, the center of Christian activity moved successively from Jerusalem to Antioch, Ephesus, Corinth and Rome, largely through its powerful promotion by Paul, the apostle to the Gentiles. In the second century, the churches of Asia Minor, largely founded by Paul and later instructed by John, are the chief source of the records of the doctrinal and other beliefs of that day made by the few whose writings have been preserved. Here is a holy list: Polycarp, bishop of Smyrna;

¹ Irenaeus says: "Mark, the disciple and interpreter of Peter, did also hand down to us by writing what had been preached by Peter."

Ignatius, bishop of Antioch; and Irenæus, born and reared in Asia Minor, but who afterward, like Paul, went westward and became the bishop of Lyons in Gaul. Besides these saintly ecclesiastical leaders there were two highly cultured Apologists in that century, Justin Martyr and Aristides. All of these chief contributors to the Christian literature of the second century, with the possible exception of Irenæus and Aristides, were made martyrs to their faith by the political power of that age, either by burning, beheading, or being cast to the wild beasts on the amusement arenas.

In the preserved writings of all but one of these holy fathers of the church there are repeated assertions of the fact that Christ, the Son of God, became man by being born of Mary the Virgin Mother. The only exception is Polycarp—simply because only a few of his brief epistles have come down to us and these are not discussions of historic or doctrinal questions but of the ethics of the Christian religion. Can we in their messages discover any valid evidence of the apostolic source of this belief?

Let us begin with Irenæus, that "great repository of Christian tradition." One of the most priceless remains of early Christian antiquity is his work, *Against Heresies*. In the tenth chapter of the very first book of this treatise, a chapter largely devoted to proclaiming and proving the unity of the faith of the church throughout the world, he says:

"The church, although dispersed throughout the whole world to the very ends of the earth, has received from the apostles and their disciples this faith:

"In one God the Father Almighty, Maker of heaven and earth and sea and all things in them.

"And in one Christ Jesus, the Son of God, incarnated for our salvation.

"And in the Holy Spirit, who announced by the prophets his dispensations and advents.

"And the birth from a Virgin and the passion and resurrection from the dead, and the bodily ascent into heaven of the beloved Christ Jesus our Lord and his Parousia from heaven in the glory of the Father."

What right had Irenæus to claim the apostles and disciples of Jesus as the source of these truths, and by whom had he been taught these things? There is one sufficient answer, others may be possible: He had heard much from that aged teacher Polycarp, whose life covered the final thirty years of the first century and the first fifty-six years of the second. Here is the statement made by Irenæus himself as to the fountain of the faith of Polycarp:

"Polycarp was not only instructed by apostles, and conversed with many who have seen Christ, but was also by apostles in Asia appointed bishop of the church at Smyrna, whom I also saw in my early youth." He then proceeds to tell many facts of the service of Polycarp, of his acquaintance with "John, the disciple of the Lord," and ends with this statement, "The church at Ephesus, founded by Saul and having John remaining among them permanently until the time of Trajan, is a true

witness of the tradition of the apostles" (*Against Heresies*, Book III, ch. 2).

It was therefore in a Pauline Church, which later was under Johannine leadership, that the young Irenæus was taught these things, mainly by Polycarp, who had conversed with John and others who had walked and talked with Jesus.

Born probably a generation before Polycarp, to whom he became a most beloved friend and adviser, is Ignatius, the bishop of Antioch. Indeed, there is a rather seductive myth told of the infancy of Ignatius, that he was that little child whom our Lord placed in the midst of the disciples. This was probably based on the title given him in the prefix to some of his epistles: "Ignatius, who is also called Theophorus, etc." Excluding all the so-called pseudo-epistles of Ignatius, we find in the genuine writings of this man contemporary with the later lives of Peter, Paul and John, sayings like these:

"Concealed from the prince of this world were the Virginity of Mary and her bearing of a child, and likewise the death of the Lord—three mysteries to be shouted out,² but wrought in the silence of God" (*Epistle to the Ephesians*, 19).

"Our Lord, truly of the race of David according to the flesh, the Son of God according to the will and power of God, was truly born of a Virgin" (*Epistle to Smyrna*, 1).

Here is a martyr of the early church, one who holds high place among those styled the apostolic fathers, whose boyhood and early manhood must have been contemporary with both the evangelism of Paul and the later supervision by John of the churches in Asia Minor, and also with the writing and dispersion of all four Gospels, who affirms without question the supernatural birth of the Saviour. Could such recognized authorities of that period as Peter, Paul and John, whose alleged silence in their writings is easily accounted for by the fact that those were records of personal experience, have been equally silent in their ministry as to their full faith in the historic reality of the birth of Jesus as told by Matthew and Luke and which certainly became a quite universal belief before the end of the Apostolic Age?

Parallel with these testimonies of ecclesiastical authorities are the teachings of the two greatest defenders of the Christian faith in the second century—Aristides of Athens and Justin Martyr, born in Samaria near Jacob's well.

Aristides writes: "The descent of Christians³ is from the Lord Jesus Christ, who is confessed by the Holy Spirit to be the Son of the Most High God, having descended from heaven for the salvation of men and having been born of a Holy Virgin" (*Apology*, ch. 15. This is from a Greek text. In another reading it says "a Hebrew Virgin." The name "Mary" is inserted in another version).

Justin Martyr, probably of Roman origin, traveled widely through

² Probably meaning that although they are divine secrets they may be openly proclaimed by the Church.

³ This idea of Christians as a new race of mankind was a common conception in the early Church and also among their enemies. See Harnack's *Expansion of Christianity*.

the church, having resided both at Ephesus and at Rome. A student in the philosophic schools of that day, he at last found his way from Plato to Christ. These pages could be filled with quotations from his *Dialogue with Trypho* and his *Apology*, including his condemnation of the denial of this truth by certain Ellonites and Gnostics. He has the constant habit of successive summaries of his beliefs, generally in the order of what is now called the Apostles' Creed. Here is an example:

"As a man he was born of a Virgin and named Jesus, and crucified and rose from the dead, and has ascended into heaven" (*Apology*, i, 46).

"This very Son of God and Firstborn of every creature who was born of a Virgin and became a man subject to suffering and was crucified under Pontius Pilate; and died and rose again from the dead and ascended into heaven" (*Dial. Trypho*, 85).

Scores more of similar sayings can be found, especially in the writings of Justin Martyr and Irenæus, who are the fullest first-hand contributors to the present time of the character, customs and beliefs of that primitive church. And they prove that this belief in the supernatural birth of Jesus Christ was quite universal in a church which had already gone to "the ends of the earth." Irenæus, whose personal experience had reached from Asia through Rome to Gaul, after stating (as above quoted) the formula of the universal faith of that era, says: "The churches in Germany have not otherwise believed or taught, nor those in Iberia [Spain], nor among the Celts, nor in the Orient, nor in Egypt, nor in Libya, nor those located in the central regions of the world."

Such a statement of the universality of this and other beliefs finds its confirmation as we locate the principal personalities in the church of that age—Aristides in Greece, Justin Martyr in Palestine, Irenæus in Gaul, and a little later, Tertullian in Africa and Clement and Origen in Alexandria, Egypt. The Syrian church of that age also, instead of the four evangelists, used the *Diatessaron* of Tatian, a pupil of Justin Martyr. That book, the earliest composite harmony of the Gospels, contained the infancy stories of Matthew and Luke. So this acceptance of the Virgin Birth is conclusively shown to be the faith of the Catholic Church of the second century, a church that not merely by unverified tradition but, as here shown, by the personal testimony of its founders and leaders, received its religious truths first hand from the apostles of Jesus Christ.

Irenæus was a pupil of Polycarp, who had been taught by apostles, and especially by that Beloved Disciple who lay at dinner on the bosom of Jesus Christ. And Polycarp had a friend whom he calls "the blessed Ignatius," whose life and experience certainly covered the last half of the first century and the first decade of the second.

Peter, Paul, John—there are no greater names in the Apostolic Age. Indeed, their character and teaching are symbols of the universal church in that and all centuries. Chevallier Bunsen, that imaginative interpreter of history, saw in Peter the principle of authority, in Paul that of liberty and in John the union of authority and freedom in love. So he asserts that Peter's spirit was converted into Romanism, that of Paul created the too excessive individualism of Protestantism, but the cath-

olic spirit of John will bring about the final brotherhood of the kingdom of God in the world.

Back to Jesus we can go by the path of Polycarp and John and of Ignatius and Paul. That, we feel, leads us historically to Bethlehem and its miracle. It is a good road to sometimes travel. But there is another we must not miss—to march with a risen, living and present Christ, by the ways that Peter, then Paul and last of all John walked in human history, until our world itself is supernaturally born again through the agency of the Spirit of God.

[These discussions of the Parthenogenetic Problem of Christianity will be concluded in the next issue of the *METHODIST REVIEW* in a brief study of the doctrinal significance of this historic fact.]

FOREIGN OUTLOOK

THE UPRISING IN CHINA

OVERSHADOWING all other events in the field of foreign relationships, during the past six weeks, is the uprising in China. It is doubtful if at any time since the establishment of the Republic in China thirteen years ago developments of such significance have been in the making in the Far East as at the present moment. When it is understood that these developments touch the rights of one-quarter of the human race something of their importance is apparent.

Before turning, however, to a more extended consideration of the China situation—which, I believe, should demand the serious first-interest of every intelligent Christian—it may not be amiss to set down in the briefest outline certain other unrelated events that should not be forgotten.

One year ago in this month the London Conference, with Germany participating for the first time with the Allies as an equal, ratified the Dawes plan and set Europe on the road toward common-sense settlement. For less than one year the Dawes plan has been in operation. Its success in respect to the solution of the reparations difficulty, however great, will take second place to what has been looked upon as an incidental achievement. By the London Conference and the Dawes plan the political camouflage covering Europe's ship of state was pretty well scraped away and now, during the six weeks just ended, it appears that in regard to more fundamental questions than reparations Europe is prepared to face realities.

Thus there now appears every prospect that the security pact—proposed, strangely enough by Germany—will secure the ratification of France and England by the time of the next session of the League of Nations early in September. It now appears improbable that, at the next League meeting, Germany will secure membership in the League. But, so far as I know, there are no competent observers of the European situation but agree that German membership in the League is now an eventual certainty. When that membership is an accomplished fact,

more than ever before the League will be the great international clearing house through which all of the great nations of the world—excluding Russia and the United States—seek to find solution for their common problems. It is not too much to say that, with Germany in the League, the Geneva organization definitely enters upon a new period in its history wherein, instead of an experiment, it will serve as the proven machinery for world settlement.

In this connection, in the United States, it is of more than ordinary significance that, during the month just ended, an influential group of peace advocates—formerly representing competing peace plans—have come together on a common program. Not the jingoes but the divisiveness of the peace forces has been the great obstacle to the movement to rid the world of war. Now, more nearly than at any previous time, some unity is appearing. The American group—including such men as Charles Clayton Morrison, former Justice Clarke, H. O. Levinson, James T. Shotwell, Halford Luccock—have agreed to pool their peace interests in a common enterprise that centers upon the immediate entrance of America into the World Court and call, eventually, for an international conference for the outlawry. This action is the more significant because all of those participating in it were obliged, doubtless, to concede some of their own convictions in the interests of unity.

The increasing perils that beset the white man's domination of the world are apparent in the French war against the Rifian tribes in North Africa. The issue in this conflict, as the French themselves admit, is that of French (in other words white) prestige against the Rifian demands for self-determination. Just now Abd-el Krim, having given the French a run for their money, has offered to settle on the basis of a recognition of his own authority over the Riff, the recognition of certain Mohammedan sovereigns and certain unimportant territorial concessions. Needless to say the Mohammedan—for that matter the so-called colored world—is watching this new enforcement of white supremacy with more than casual interest.

In regard to the China situation, it now appears probable that President Coolidge will call an international conference to consider the questions at issue some time during September. There is no denying the fact that the other Powers have consented to this conference with reluctance. The century-old method of satisfying non-white peoples with promises of justice just around the corner has worked so well in the past that it is difficult for old-order diplomats to realize that the present situation has gone beyond the place where such indefinite concessions can compensate for actual concessions. President Coolidge, apparently, is determined to carry on with the Open Door policy of John Hay. That policy never had more than the half-hearted support of certain other powers in the past and it is probable that to invoke it in the present situation will not be an easy task.

A number of facts need to be borne in mind concerning the actual

situation in China. First of these is the influence of the Soviets. It requires only a superficial familiarity with the program of Soviets to know that they have had a hand in the China disturbances. They have spent money in China and have lured Chinese students into their employ as propagandists. Communism welcomes disorder and, with little question, is gleeful because of the unrest in China.

But it is singularly superficial to place the major blame upon the Soviets. In the United States it is popular to blame upon the Russians everything, wherever it occurs, which we do not welcome and which we cannot explain, otherwise, without embarrassment. There are real reasons behind the outbreak in China—reasons that have been developing through a number of years—that would have brought on these disturbances sooner or later regardless of what authority presided over the Kremlin.

First and immediate of these causes was the strike in the Japanese cotton mills of Shanghai. Some business men in China have written home of the "idyllic" conditions prevailing in the foreign-owned mills of Shanghai, particularly as compared with the Chinese mills. But the fact that children and women are obliged to work twelve and fourteen hours a day in a foreign mill, seven days a week, is hardly justified by pointing to worse conditions in Chinese mills. Moreover, it is true, I believe, that the betterment of industrial conditions in China is being led not by the foreign capitalists but by the Chinese industrialists themselves. And, however oppressive Chinese conditions may be, they do not represent foreign exploitation, and people, before now, have preferred bad government to foreign government.

Out of the strike of workmen in Shanghai grew the revolting attack upon Chinese students in which a number were killed and a great many more injured. This resort to force aroused the nation as no other event in recent history. So effective, in fact, has been the subsequent outbreak against foreigners that the Powers—forced, it appears, against their will—now seem ready to squarely face the demands of the Chinese. These demands include, chiefly, the abolition of extra-territoriality, the abandonment of foreign concessions, the return of certain ceded territories and the revision of the tariff.

Almost precisely these demands were before the Washington Conference. In the Nine Power Pacts, drawn up there, China was promised an early consideration of these questions. For two and one-half years now these promises have gone unfulfilled. France, up to a few weeks ago, had refused to ratify the Pact because of a dispute with China over the settlement of the Boxer Indemnity. France now having ratified, the way is open to make good on the pledges of the Powers.

The section of the American press that is most vociferously jingoistic has united with similar elements in France and Great Britain to oppose any immediate concessions to China. Extra-territoriality, it is said, cannot be granted because conditions are so disordered in China that the life and property of foreigners would not be safe unless protected under foreign flags. It is significant, in this connection, to know that

at the present time more than twice as many westerners in China are without such protection as possess it. Since the war Germans, Russians, Austrians and many other nationals in China have been without these rights. There is no evidence of importance to indicate that Germans and Russians and others have suffered for lack of this protection. In fact there are many foreigners who assert that their place might be more secure without this protection than with it. Certainly, when trouble breaks loose there has been little indication that extra-territoriality has stayed the Chinese mobs.

One of the most hopeful signs of the times in China is found in the courageous position of the Christian missionaries. For the most part these representatives of the Prince of Peace and Justice have dared to go on record demanding that China be given a hearing and that China's rights be respected. There has been, in consequence, a new outburst of certain of the "vested interests" in China against Christian missions. In a letter printed recently in the Boston Transcript an American in China protests that the missionaries actually "had the impudence to denounce all foreign oppression." No greater tribute to the type of men and women who stand for Christianity in China could be expressed. This position, too, has been taken in the face of the fact that much of the present movement—as I pointed out in the last issue of the REVIEW—is anti-Christian. In the taking of such a stand the missionaries are providing the most effective answer to their foes.

The present situation in China is symptomatic of the unrest that seethes throughout the whole East. There are matters of property to be thought of and economic considerations and trade concerns to consider. But fifty years hence, it will be vitally important to know just where organized Christianity took its stand in this particular period. The forces now working in China—however easily they may be dismissed as Red and juvenile—are swinging inevitably toward the control of the affairs of that nation, as similar forces are swinging into control elsewhere. The so-called Christian West has now the opportunity to find a cooperative basis for settlement. Ten years from now it may be impossible to discover that cooperative basis. It will be a matter for serious world interest, half a century from now, if the nations of the West, in the present situation, drive the Chinese further from the desire for a conciliatory settlement toward a more positive belief in force as the only means for establishing justice. That Christian representatives stand for conciliation is but one proof of the responsibility that rests upon the missionary enterprise around the world.

STANLEY HIGH.

New York City.

BOOK NOTICES

Evangelical Humanism. By LYNN HAROLD HOUGH. Pp. 199. New York and Cincinnati: The Abingdon Press. (Published contemporaneously by the Epworth Press, London, England.)

DOCTOR HOUGH is the second representative of American Methodism chosen to deliver the Fernley Lecture before the British Wesleyan Conference. Doctor Charles J. Little, the president of Garrett Biblical Institute, was the first American granted that high honor, many years ago. No better choice on the planet could have been made for July, 1925, than Lynn Harold Hough.

This notice is not a review (that will appear in the next issue of the METHODIST REVIEW); it is simply inserted to call attention to this most important work which is now in circulation. But the contents of the book should be made known:

I. The Evangelical Spirit. II. The Strength of the Evangelical Position. III. The Limitations of Evangelicalism. IV. The Spirit of Humanism. V. The Strength of Humanism. VI. The Weakness of Humanism. VII. The Points of Contact Between Humanism and Evangelicalism. VIII. Points of Divergence between Evangelicalism and Humanism. IX. Evangelical Humanism.

The word Humanism is here used in a wider way than the modern pragmatic treatment of the term. It has somewhat that same significance as is given it in those brilliant Lyman Beecher Lectures of Albert Parker Fitch on *Preaching and Paganism*, in his lecture on "The Children of Zion and the Sons of Greece." Both of these great preachers and scholars show us that man's full life must be made not merely by his own mind but by the grace of God.

A fuller discussion of Doctor Hough's admirable lectures will appear in our next number.

The Church of the Spirit. A Brief Survey of the Spiritual Tradition in Christianity. By FRANCIS GREENWOOD PEABODY. New York: The Macmillan Company. \$2.

A DISTINCTION has been made in every age between the church institutional and the church spiritual, as though there could be no affinity between the two. Such an extreme view is unwarranted by the facts of history. In the very nature of things, it is inevitable that the ecclesiastic absorbed in questions of administration should occasionally find himself at odds with the mystic who brushes aside institutional forms as superfluous. They are extremists on the wrong track if they regard themselves as opponents because they then fail to realize that Christianity can secure its best triumphs when the Christ consciousness is united with the church consciousness. What we need in Protestantism is a synthetic churchmanship in Christ, that will relieve the tension for a spiritual catholicism. This type of evangelical and sacramental faith will insure the freedom of liberal intercourse in the atmosphere of peace.

Professor Peabody's volume indicates some ways of approach to this much-desired goal. This is the last of a series of most suggestive studies on the teaching of the New Testament and its applicability to modern life. It is a historical survey which in this author's treatment becomes an *apologia pro fide sua*. We cannot accept the form of faith because at certain vital points it is contrary to the rich deposit of historic Christianity. Unitarianism, to be sure, has helped to humanize some Christian doctrines. Its protest against scholastic theology, its plea for the ethical mysticism of Jesus, and its service in weakening the shackles of metaphysical creedalism have been beneficial. But its view of the Incarnate Son of God and of his Atoning Sacrifice on the Cross has separated it from evangelical Christianity. There cannot be any union between Unitarianism and Trinitarianism until this central truth of our holy gospel receives merited recognition. With this important proviso in mind there is much that we can profitably learn from those who hold the Unitarian faith. Professor Peabody is one of the most helpful of its representatives.

There is a note of pessimism running through this volume which is not justifiable. Bitter theological controversies have assuredly darkened the pages of church history. Liberals no less than conservatives have spoken unwisely and inconsiderately due to the provincialism of partisanship. On the other hand, there are many golden pages which record the deeds of lovers of our Lord and of their kind, whose spiritual fragrance has been a perennial benediction. The communion of saints has been enjoyed even among fissiparous sects. "The Church of the Spirit is no longer a remote ideal but a practical reality." Doctor Peabody is right that some popular programs of church unity "fail to touch the real problem of discipleship"; but he is wrong when he adds that the fundamental difficulty is in the substitution of Christology for Christianity. We believe that Christ is Christianity and that a Christology which offers us a reduced Christ, whose features do not correspond with the full-length portrait of the New Testament, cannot be made the basis of a workable Christian unity.

Let it be granted that intellectual agreement is impossible and not even desirable. Yet the conscious community with Christ must be based upon a conception that does justice to the fullness of his deity and humanity. Otherwise the Christian Church will be held together by a rope of sand. Sixteen hundred years ago the first Ecumenical Council at Nicæa affirmed the faith in the Divine-Human Christ. The difference between the words *Homo-ousios*, of the same substance, and *Homoi-ousios*, of like substance, was not simply that of a single letter, the Greek iota. It was the difference between the belief in the real Incarnation and in a phantom Incarnation. The affirmative faith of Nicæa has stood the storms of these many years and it is essentially that of the New Testament confession, "Jesus is Lord." It was this substantial faith that has saved the church from the threatened betrayals of vagaries and fanaticisms. It cannot be otherwise in the present day of undisciplined cults that would dim the sublime glory of the Incarnate and Atoning Christ.

These strictures must not be regarded as attempts to depreciate other sections of this book which have a significant timeliness. The chapter titles are "The Church of Authority and the Church of the Spirit," "The History of the Church of the Spirit," "The Sins of the Church of the Spirit," "The Church of the Spirit Militant," "The Church of the Spirit Triumphant." There is much wholesome thought in these pages, expressed in beautiful language and revealing a tenderness and refinement of soul. It merits the reverential and thoughtful study of all who desire to further the cause of spiritual Christianity, free from illiteracy, complacency, indolence and intolerance.

OSCAR L. JOSEPH.

TWO RECENT THEOLOGICAL WORKS

Immanence and Incarnation. By S. F. DAVENPORT. Pp. xxvi, 279. New York: The Macmillan Company.

The Doctrine of Grace Up to the End of the Pelagian Controversy. By ERNEST JAUNCEY. Pp. 299. New York: The Macmillan Company.

Two young theologians of the Church of England have given us these two valuable treatises. To properly review them would require far more space than is available. Only brief notices can be given, with recommendation of both volumes to all students of theology.

Mr. Davenport's work was the Norrisian Prize Essay in the University of Cambridge for the year 1924. It is genuinely theistic from the Christian standpoint. Deism holds to the divine transcendence and not to immanence, pantheism to immanence and not transcendence, and pure theism to both immanence and transcendence with proper emphasis on the Divine Personality. Perhaps immanence is being too much talked about in current doctrinal thinking, yet it does have important religious values, especially as realized in the Incarnation. The author deals ably with various philosophical conceptions as to immanence and its relation to creation and evolution, but it is his discussion of the various theories of the Incarnation which is most valuable of all. He closes with a chapter on "Incarnation and the Trinity."

One wonders if the author in trying to escape both extreme absolutism and radical pragmatism does not really base his doctrine on both. But he reaches the real foundation of certainty when he says: "In the living religious experience alone is to be found all living and real religion; such an experience alone must ultimately form the touchstone of all inspired writings, all dogmas, all authorities." While he properly refuses to follow Ritschl all the way, he still comes to a conclusion very significant: "It is only a radically false philosophy that maintains a rigid and ultimate separation of value-judgments from existential-judgments; the valuable alone is real and only the real is valuable. . . . God, the Absolute, the utterly *real*, is at once the heart and home, the Alpha and Omega, of the Good, the Beautiful and the True." So relativity, pragmatism and absolutism can be merged in one philosophy.

This book is beautifully written, very eloquent in many ways, and opulent in those quotations from poets, philosophers and theologians which are the richest gems of their works.

The Doctrine of Grace is a treatment of the vital problems of Christian anthropology, largely by the historical method. After an introductory definition of Grace, that preternatural "free, undeserved favor of God to mankind," this English rector proceeds to study its position both in Pagan and Jewish teaching, the teaching in the New Testament in the Gospels, the Pauline and the Catholic Epistles, the views in the early church, including the apostolic fathers, Gnostics, Manichæans and especially the western theology from Irenæus to Chrysostom.

Most important of all is the chapter on "The Pelagian Controversy," a most thorough treatment especially of the debate between Augustine and Pelagius.

Another volume is to be written by Mr. Jauncey, dealing both historically and dogmatically with the doctrine of Grace, bringing it down to the present position of the Church. It is the historical value of his work which is chiefest. Its many original texts from ancient authors, accompanied by admirable and accurate translations, make it more than a doctrinal hand book, it is almost a reference work on this topic.

Doubtless the current superficial opinions of both moralists and some theologians are too entirely Pelagian. We need to feel and act upon the principle that salvation is entirely a work of the Divine Power and Love. Yet we must not follow the too mechanical view of Saint Augustine. Perhaps not the beliefs of Pelagius but the criticisms made by him had their worth and saved the Church from fatalistic theories.

A little more theology, studied as philosophically and historically as in these two works, would help to save our Christian faith at the present period of shallow discussions between the ultra-orthodox and the pretended liberals.

The Life, Letters and Religion of Saint Paul. By C. T. Wood. Pp. xiv+418. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. Price, \$3.25.

IN spite of the multiplicity of lives and doctrinal treatises on Paul and Paulinism, there is room for this book, for many reasons, such as its scholarship, its simplicity, and its real spiritual insight. Few religious leaders have been more perversely interpreted than Paul. He has been far more freely represented as a theologian than as a saint. And yet anyone who approaches his work unbiassed by *a priori* dogmatism ought to discover that everything in the record of his life and teaching is a vivid outsetting of his inward experience.

The writer, who is Fellow and Dean of Queen's College, Cambridge, England, has had in mind young theological students—but his book is more than that. Without professing to present new views of Paulinism, it will be a far greater source of new discovery to many students of Paul's writings than the perpetual chilly concentration upon his theology by a large majority of other writers of his life. It is the religion of

Paul, something of which every Christian mystic can find an echo in his own experience, which found expression in his letters to churches and friends. There is no jargon so stupid and of so little either mental or moral value than much that dogmatists have professed to find in Paul and have forced into their theologies and, even more unfortunately, into confessions of faith.

The life here related is honestly based on the trustworthy records of Luke and on the Epistles of Paul himself. The latter are here given with brief introductions, and a modern version (largely a paraphrase) of the more important portions with sufficient comment to give clear meanings to all these earliest documents of the Christian Church.

As to Saint Paul's religious belief, there are two phases which are a real ferment in the doctrinal discussion of the present age. First, it contains nothing of that false fundamental parody of so-called systematic theology, whose basis is chiefly metaphysics and not religious reality. Second, it is utterly different from that mischievous type of Modernism whose religious experience is largely a pseudo-psychology of auto-suggestion and not the Risen Christ by his Spirit coming by saving faith into union with our own spirit and life.

Mr. Wood follows Sir William Ramsay in his well-confirmed opinion that the Galatians to whom the Epistle was directed were of southern and not northern Galatia. As to the Pastoral Epistles, he suggests a solution of the difficulties both as to style and to expressed opinion, in the possible free editing of posthumous material left by the apostle by someone in the following generation with a somewhat different atmosphere. This, however, is presented as a "tentative solution." The critical method of this work is scientific and scholarly, utterly free from rationalistic radicalism. And its simplicity is much like that of Paul himself.

There are other works on Paul which all specialists must possess, such as those by Ramsay, Deissmann, Pfeiderer and David Smith, and such commentaries as Sanday's *Romans*, Burton's *Galatians*, Lightfoot's *Philippians*, and others. But those poor men who can own only one volume on Paul's life, letters, and religion had better secure this one and master it from cover to cover. They will find it full of most absorbing interest, as well as rich instructively.

The Historical Development of Christianity. By OSCAR L. JOSEPH. Pp. 189. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. Price, \$1.50.

THERE is no more marvelous and fascinating element in history than the remarkable development of Christianity. Yet perhaps there is no part of the story of mankind so little known. Every thoughtful Christian ought to strengthen himself, both for his own living and also for facing the contest of all life by mastering this noble record. Perhaps there is no greater stimulus to real advance in the church than to constantly go back to its beginning and recover its prime spirit of progress.

In this little volume that story is told concisely and clearly, with true historic vision and literary charm, with Christian courage for its

essential truth and proper tolerance for the multiplied variations and oppositions which have marked its growth. Beginning with the Pentecostal days of the first century, it proceeds to picture the transitions of the second, the triumphs and defects of the Nicene period, the coming of ecclesiastical imperialism with the following conflict of church and state, the confusions and controversies of the mediæval period, the influence of the new day of the Renaissance, the Protestant Reformation and its aftermath of reactions and sectarianism, the rationalism and revivalism of the eighteenth century, the following period, just past by, of romanticism and criticism, and the present age with its tremendous trend, in spite of current controversy, toward what may be called an Evangelical Catholicism. The following final paragraph of this book is a true summary of its substance:

"Our survey has covered many fields of thought and activity. We have seen that abuses and errors have marred the church's testimony, that virtues and sacrifices have glorified its service, and that it has shed a hallowing light over the seats of darkness. Paradoxical as it may seem, the very crimes and corruptions associated with the church constitute an argument for its vitality, in that it has been able to survive them and to be re clad in the garments of health and holiness. Providential revivals have followed periods of decadence and stagnation. The church has verily had a checkered career, but ever and anon it has risen from the ashes of its desolation, to take hold again of the torch of truth and to lead toward the City of God. Empires and kingdoms have risen and disappeared. New forces are making trial of their strength, but their antagonism and threatening need not alarm the church nor should they be treated as negligible. The church which is alive to the needs of its own day has the assurance of being able to meet them, with tools forged on the anvils of eternity. The building that has weathered many storms needs to be renovated and enlarged, but the foundation is secure."

Some of us may wish that in the chapter on "Romanticism and Criticism" some mention had been made of Symbolo-Fideism, that remarkable Ritschlian development in the Free Church of France, led by such scholars as Sabatier and Menegoz. But in a brief book every historic fact cannot be included. This work is abundant in detail and yet clear in interpretation.

Doctor Joseph, well known to readers of the *METHODIST REVIEW*, is one of the few masters of the widest wealth of religious literature. He is more than that. As a minister he knows how to present all his opulence of learning in a manner comprehensible to the common mind. This is a first-class textbook both for class work and for private study.

The Relations Between Arabs and Israelites Prior to the Rise of Islam.

By D. S. MARGOLIOU. (The Schweich Lectures, 1921.) Pp. 86. London: The British Academy, 1924.

IN three lectures, covering respectively the pre-biblical period, the biblical period, and the early Christian centuries, the Laudian Professor of Arabic in the University of Oxford discusses with great learning and

originality some of the most difficult problems relating to the history of the Israelites and of the Jews in their relations with the pre-Islamic Arabs. The student of the Old Testament will have to reckon with this book, even though he cannot always agree with the conclusions of the author.

Professor Margoliouth finds "the earliest home of the Israelites as of other Semites in Arabia," basing his opinion on a comparative study of the languages, the religions, and the institutions. It has been generally recognized that classical Arabic represents an earlier stage in the linguistic development than the Hebrew; many anomalies in the grammar, the vocabulary, and the spelling of the latter can be readily explained by comparison with Arabic forms. The discovery of numerous pre-Islamic inscriptions in South Arabia (Saba, Ma'in, Hadramaut, and Qataban) throws new light on the history of the Old Testament Hebrew: the word *bara'* (to create) (Gen. 1. 1) "found as a Hebraism in the classical Arabic, is of common occurrence in these inscriptions in the sense *make, erect*." Biblical proper names, such as Chesed, Nebat, Caleb, Hophni, Zadok, Nathan, Absalom, have been identified in South Arabian texts; the obscure etymology of the names Jehoash and Josiah is no longer a puzzle: they mean "Yaho gave" and "Yaho shall give"; they furnish evidence for the worship of a god Yaho or Yah in South Arabia and show that the divine name Yahweh (Jehovah) is not derived from the verb *to be* (Ex. 3. 14). The element *ram* in Abram, Jehoram, etc., means "desire"; Jeroboam means "may 'Amm rear," 'Amm (or 'Ammu) being a divine name which Winckler claimed to have found in Deut. 32. 43: "Praise, ye nations, 'Ammu . . ." Some religious and social institutions of the Israelites have their parallels in South Arabia.

Aside from philological questions, the Arabian records are of value for the study of the literature, the versification, and the history of the Israelites. Certain parts of the Old Testament "may well go back to an Arabic original," particularly Prov. 30 and 31, 1-9, and the Book of Job; the latter "rendered into Hebrew at a time when the literature of the Israelites was in need of models." The bewildering irregularity of Hebrew prosody is explained by the loss of the metrical features based on grammar, in the course of translation from an older language. "Hence the Psalms and the prophecies have acquired an earnestness and a profundity which would have suffered seriously from the artificial restraints of counting syllables and searching for rhymes." Of the four best known South Arabian kingdoms, Saba, Ma'in and Hadramaut are mentioned in the Old Testament, and it is possible to trace, in a measure, the process whereby the Arabs came to be known to the Israelites.

The evidence of Jewish settlements in Arabia before the rise of Islam found in Christian and Moslem authors is so vague and obscure that the historical facts cannot be ascertained. Mohammed was of course well acquainted with Judaism, but the traces of a pre-Islamic monotheism in Arabia lack the characteristic features of the religion of the Jews.

There is no reason to question the close relation between Israelites and Arabs before the Hebrews appeared on the scene of history. "The

tribes from which were sprung the ancestors of Israel were nurtured in the desert before memory began. Here was wrought the racial fiber which distinguished Israel to the end." (Carleton Noyes, *The Genius of Israel*, p. 4.) The prehistoric common origin of Israelites and Arabs in the desert explains their linguistic and social affinities. But Professor Margoliouth cannot plausibly show that in historical time the relations between them were close enough to warrant the supposition that some parts of the Old Testament were translated from the Arabic. If the last chapters of Proverbs and Job are not of Israelitic origin, it seems more plausible to consider them Edomit. The Edomites were noted for their wisdom (Jer. 49. 7; Obad. 8) and a section of their royal annals found its way into the Old Testament (Gen. 36. 20-39); Ben Yehuda claims that the language of Prov. 30-31 is Edomit (Journal of the Palestinian Oriental Society I, 1113ff., 1921) and the geographical background of Job points to that same nation.

ROBERT H. PFEIFFER.

Boston University School of Theology.

THREE BOOKS ON THE SPIRITUAL GOSPEL

The Gospel of John. By BENJAMIN W. ROBINSON. Pp. 275. New York: The Macmillan Company. Price, \$2.25.

The Incarnate Glory. By WILLIAM MANSON. Pp. 250. New York: George H. Doran Company. Price, \$2.00, net.

Knowledge of God in Johannine Thought. By MARY REDINGTON ELY. Pp. 151. New York: The Macmillan Company. Price, \$1.50.

THERE has never been and perhaps never will be a satisfactory commentary of the Fourth Gospel. Some interpreters have seen a little way into its mysteries, but there remain still greater depths to fathom. It is supremely the Spiritual Gospel, and no final scientific statement of spiritual truth will ever be made. All these three books go a bit deeper into its mystic truths.

Professor Robinson's work is a handbook for both students and teachers. It is an expository comment, based on careful exegesis, accompanied with a new translation of some sections of the Gospel. It is scholarly but not technical; indeed, it is somewhat popular in its methods of expression. It emphasizes the sermonic style of a large part of this Gospel, such as that on marriage (chapter 2), that on birth (chapter 3), on water (chapter 4), on food (chapter 6), etc. Everywhere we are led to cross the bridge from the physical to the spiritual.

The Incarnate Glory is a most brilliant expository study of the Gospel of John. Less attention is given to difficult critical problems, though they are not avoided, but it goes straight to the significant worth of this Gospel in its fresh revelation and experience of the living God. It is a new apologetic, not theoretical but experimental. Traditionalism had no place in that Gospel. Even more than in the synoptics, the Gospel takes the place of the Law. Those words it records, spoken by the

Risen Lord, "Receive ye the Holy Spirit," are the true atmosphere of this climax of written revelation.

The third book here noticed is not, like the others, an exposition of this Gospel as a whole; it is a discussion confined to that one important element, the knowledge of God. The mysticism of John is ably revealed both in its relation and contrast to that of historic and Hellenistic Judaism, of the Mysteries, of Gnosticism, of the Hermetic speculations, the Odes of Solomon, and also of Paulinism. There were "illuminations" in the religions of that age, but in John there is a new and higher concept of knowledge, a relationship to God real and vital by a progressive personal fellowship with Jesus Christ.

There are superficial differences but a substantial similarity in these three most valuable works. If the religious thought of to-day could absorb and live the spiritual experience here found in this last written of all books of the Bible, it would end all schisms and give us a truly catholic faith, one that is personal and yet all-inclusive.

Christian Monasticism: A Great Force in History. By IAN C. HANNAH, F.S.A., Professor of Church History, Oberlin College. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1925. \$2.50.

THIS comprehensive duodecimo of 270 pages is one of the best of those excellent general discussions of the monastic development which we have in English, such as I. Gregory Smith's *Rise of Christian Monasticism*, Wishart's *Monks and Monasteries*, and Workman's *Evolution of the Monastic Ideal*. It covers the ground in seventeen chapters: Desert Monks of Egypt, Work of Basil and Successors, First Monks of the West, Benedict, Monk Builders of a World, Celtic Monasticism, Nuns, Hermits and Pilgrims, House of Cluny, Bernard and Cistercians, Rise of Friars, Monk as Missionary, as Statesman, as Soldier, Monastic Literature, Monastic Art, Decline of Great Mediæval Orders, Jesuits and Later Orders. Though brief the work is not scrappy or hurried, but has discussions ample for all ordinary purposes founded on wide reading and guided by an impartial judgment to which neither Protestant nor Catholic can often take exception. Excellent bibliographical notes are at the end of each chapter. A few corrections or suggestions for a second edition might be welcome.

P. 27: Paphnutius was called buffalo probably from his shaggy appearance, not on account of his fondness for being alone. P. 24: Monastic life was termed philosophy not because it was the "noblest expression" of ancient Greek culture, but because it fitted a contemplative self-denying life, as the context to its use in Eusebius *Hist. Eccl.* 6. 3, 9 shows. Jerome hardly "recognized papal claims as amply as any one could wish" (p. 68). He regarded Christ as the Rock and Peter as the little rock, confessed that Pope Liberius subscribed heretical pravity (*Chr. an* 357), though he had real attachment to the Roman see, and compliments were handed around in those days. P. 72: It is exaggerated to say that in 1004 Europe had "one of the most brilliant cultures the world has ever

known—romantic, beautiful, and picturesque, while Christian to the core." The title of Cunningham's book (same page) is *S. Austin and his Place in the History of Christian Thought*. It is now known that the common text of Benedict's Rule has been much added to or interpolated. See Hauck, *Realencycck.* vol. 23, p. 185 (p. 85). The efforts of Geneva and New England to Christianize a city or a state were much more successful than the mediæval (see p. 97). It is far from true that in the Middle Ages—especially the latter part—the monks made a united Europe and "left no room for nations with their senseless animosities." Nations were growing up and they were fighting each other in good orthodox style. P. 109: By far the best book on Patrick is Zimmer, *Celtic Church in Britain and Ireland* (1902). The Patrick of most of the historians and biographers is a legend. A slight dislocation in the arguments at the celebrated Council of Whitby 664 (p. 111), as Wilfrid did not rest his cause on the inherent right of the pope to decide such matters, but after long argument from other reasons he brought in what all acknowledged, that Peter was given the keys. Author weaves a pretty picture (p. 121) of the memories of the pilgrimages to the shrine of Thomas Becket in Canterbury in the good old Roman Catholic days suggesting *Pilgrim's Progress* to Bunyan. I am sorry there is no evidence for it. So far as we know Bunyan never heard of Chaucer's *Canterbury Tales*, nor even of the pilgrimages. There had been none of the latter for 150 years, and their very memory had vanished to all except students and historians. Nor is there any more evidence for the opinion that "mediævalism inspired" *Pilgrim's Progress*, or that "its general atmosphere still preserves much of the old monastic point of view." There were two things alone which "inspired" that famous allegory of 1677-78, the Bible and Bunyan's genius, and its point of view is Biblical and not monastic. Nor is it the "spirit of the Middle Ages that pervades the work" (p. 122), but of the New Testament and only in that sense of the Middle Ages or modern ages.

On p. 174, line 4, read *Catholicos* for *Catholics*. It is far from true that the "difference in the actual standards of living in the Middle Ages was less than to-day" (pp. 188-9). In numerous communities to-day—especially in America—there are hardly any poor at all, people are practically on the same social level, while in the Middle Ages classes were sharply divided and almost crystallized, and below the lowest were thousands if not millions of serfs who from our point of view were slaves. The same remark applies to p. 193, inasmuch as no serf could become a monk except with the permission of his master. I am sorry to say so, but the picturesque story of Luther's throwing his ink-pot at the devil in the Wartburg is a legend, and the interesting conclusion which the author draws from it is spoiled (p. 220). Perhaps the word "legend" is not the right one to use to characterize the common judgment voiced in the next sentence, that Erasmus was "in many ways far kindlier and more lovable" than Luther, but it is mistaken just the same. In kindness, hospitality and lovable qualities Luther was really a more gracious soul than Erasmus, and far more unselfish. It is slightly misleading

to say that Pascal had a "virtually Calvinistic theology," for, besides being a Roman Catholic, he was rather Augustinian and Pauline than Calvinistic. Speaking of great minds once under Jesuit influence breaking away from the Society, it is misleading to speak of Descartes and Voltaire as "trained" by that order, though they did attend a Jesuit college—did they even take the Exercises?—and much more so of Pascal, who did not enter their college or any other (see p. 257). P. 258: for Theatines (twice) read Theatines. P. 260: author omits best work, namely, R. W. Sockman, Ph.D., *Revival of Conventual Life in the Church of England*, New York, 1917. (Though information as to lay-out of the Abbey of Croyland may not be affected by the fact that Ingulf's Chronicles of it are supposititious, this fact seems to have escaped Maitland and our author. See p. 228 and note.)

J. A. FAULKNER.

Drew Theological Seminary.

"*From the Edge of the Crowd*," "Being the Message of a Pagan Mind upon Christ Jesus." By ARTHUR JOHN GOSSIP. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. (T. & T. Clark, Edinburgh.) Price, \$2.50.

THE above is the caption of a very striking and unusual volume of sermons. All through these sermons pulsate with the questions and needs of the man in the crowd to-day.

Mr. Gossip is one of the younger ministers of Scotland, and had a very vivid and vital experience with the soldiers of Britain in the World War and comes to his task of preaching with a freshness and reality that makes his volume at once a blessing to the layman and an inspiration to the preacher.

Many of the titles are arresting without being flippant, for instance "Rusting Grace," "The Message of Jesus the Layman," "That Queer Complex, Human Nature," "The Gospel According to Christ's Enemies," "God's Roadmakers," "The Audacious Claim of the Human Spirit."

The opening paragraph of the first sermon affords a good illustration of his arresting style. The text is "Unto him that hath loved us, and loosed us from our sins by his blood, and made us kings and priests unto God and his Father" (Rev. 1. 5, 6). At once the preacher begins with,— "What exactly has Christ done for you? What is there in your life that needs Christ to explain it, and that, apart from him, simply could have not been there at all? If there is nothing then your religion is a sheer futility. But then that is your fault, not Jesus Christ's. For when we open the New Testament, it is to come upon whole companies of excited people, their faces all aglow, their hearts dazed and bewildered by the immensity of their own good fortune. Apparently they find it difficult to think of anything but this amazing happening that has befallen them; quite certainly they cannot keep from laying almost violent hands on every chance passer-by, and pouring out yet over again the whole astounding story."

Every one of these studies has an originality and freshness of its own. Take for instance "That Queer Complex, Human Nature," where the

heights and depths of human nature are sounded, or "The Sixth Sense," in which the consciousness of God is emphasized in a very vivid way.

Mr. Gossip has been a growing influence in the Scotland of to-day, and the book reveals at least a part of the reason for it.

These sermons are distinctly Christo-centric. Surely in these times the greatest need of our preaching is this, that through it all and in it all the personality of Jesus Christ shall speak. There is no discussion about Christ in the book, but everywhere Christ appears in his divine character and saving power. Ministers who are anxious to so present Christ and seeking how to do it with freshness and power will do well to study this volume of sermons.

ROBERT BAGNELL.

The Imprisoned Splendor. A Study in Human Values. By J. H. CHAMBERS MACAULEY. New York: George H. Doran Company. Price, \$2.50.

THIS is a very thoughtful and illuminating study of the permanent values of the Christian religion. It deals especially with the attitude earnest Christians should take towards the expression now being given Christianity.

The central thesis of these essays is that there is a splendor of God revealed in all creation that should find its highest and fullest expression in man, individually and socially. This divine splendor is imprisoned because men do not release it by an adequate relation to Jesus Christ who is the Revealer of the Father.

There is a fine development of the theme from the opening chapter, "A Hut to Live In," to the last one, "A Voice from Galilee."

The whole volume requires careful thinking but is very much worth while.

ROBERT BAGNELL.

Harrisburg, Pa.

Europe Turns the Corner. By STANLEY HIGH. Pp. 308. New York and Cincinnati: The Abingdon Press. Price, \$2.00.

THERE are few more capable interpreters of world problems than this young man who wrote *The Revolt of Youth*. To an opulent educational preparation he has added a wide and careful personal observation in Europe from West to East. But back of it all is the possession of Christian idealism which alone can measure the meaning of historic processes. Only one who has the spirit of Christ, the Master of all mankind, can bring to the current questions of this troubled age suggested solutions worthy of consideration.

Last year, 1924, was an actual turning point in post-war history, especially in Europe. The governmental record of the British Labor Party; the overturn of Poincaré in France and the coming of more liberal policies under Herriot and others who have followed him; the initiation of the Dawes Plan for economic settlements; the recognition of Russia by England, France and Japan; the proposed Protocol for outlawing war by

the League of Nations and our more active American interest in the saving of Europe—these are freshly discussed as Colonel Edward M. House states in his introduction to this book, "in a calm and inimitable way."

Mr. High has not only traveled widely but has been granted unusually intimate intercourse with political leaders everywhere in Europe. While he has personally a forward-looking mind, he does not deal with these problems in any recklessly radical way, but with well-balanced judgment and a sympathetic spirit. The utterly false statements made so common by political and business propaganda through the public press are here corrected by a sensible statement of facts based on first-hand information and a broad perspective of observation.

Shall we try to fairly guess the Russian Riddle, to understand the League of Nations and the World Court, to comprehend the present religious situation and the means of Christian reconstruction, the relation and duty of our own land at this crisis, to get a glimpse of the dim but growing picture of the slow rise of central Europe from chaos to order—there is probably no single treatise which both so generally and yet in definite detail presents both question and probable answer more fully than this book. If American politicians and capitalists could only grasp this message and its meaning, they would see at once that the sole way to end, for example, the evil side of Russian Communism is not by isolating the Soviet governments but by increasing political, social and commercial relationships.

Here is one thing which Stanley High does not say, but it certainly can be seen between the lines: Patriotism and nationalism have played a great part in civilization and have both helped and hurt human history; but the hour has come for a new patriotism when the love of country is made perfect in the love of humanity and for a new nationalism by which any country may become both more powerful and better protected by the international spirit.

Tales of Travel. By the Marquis CURZON of Kedleston. New York: George H. Doran Company. Price, \$7.50.

EVERY year the number of those who engage in travel increases. The lists of sailings fill several columns in the newspapers. We enjoy far greater facilities to-day, but few travel leisurely and with the full equipment with which Lord Curzon invariably set out on his journeys. Before visiting a place he mastered every book about it and while on the spot he set down his impressions in a diary. His travels were not of the desultory but of the purposeful kind. He promises a second volume setting forth his philosophy of travel and dealing with unrelated subjects in a more scientific fashion. The nature of that projected volume might be surmised from two chapters in the present one. "The Voice of Memnon" and "The Singing Sands" bring together a mass of evidence on natural phenomena, possible only to one whose indefatigable zeal as a traveler was combined with an insistent desire for first-hand information.

"A multitude of wild conjectures based on imagination, but claiming a pseudo-scientific or mechanical interest, crumble away as soon as they are touched by the merciless finger of fact" (p. 120). One impression received after reading these two chapters, in which the arts of the archæologist, the historian and the traveler are evidenced, is that the ignorant are ever prone to assign supernatural causes to what they do not understand.

The world is open to us as never before, and when nations are in the crucible, a knowledge of their traits and peculiarities is an indispensable virtue. Nowhere is the difference between the East and the West better shown than in the exquisite chapter on "Humors of Travel." It not only illustrates how what is tedious could be enlivened by pleasantries but also how idiosyncrasies of temperament find unexpected exhibitions. Take, for instance, the section on "The Curiosity of Li Hung Chang," which cleverly diagnoses a characteristic of the Oriental who suavely asks personal questions that the reserved Occidental would regard as impertinent. The chapter on "Pages from a Diary" contains many impressionistic sketches of scenery and life. What can excel in vivid portraiture the two pages on "By the Waters of Babylon," when the reader feels the fall of night upon the mystic landscape of the Euphrates? For picturesque description the two chapters on Waterfalls could hardly be excelled.

The longer chapters are so rich in observation, information and appreciation that it is not surprising this genuine traveler regarded all countries as his washpot and all mankind his friend. The fanaticism of the dervish is thrillingly described in "The Drums of Kairwan," so that one is able to visualize the grim and almost fiendish ceremonials of these gruesome followers of the Prophet. "The Palaestra of Japan" tells of the Japanese wrestlers with a sense of humor modified by a sense of impatience. The chapter on "The Amir of Afghanistan" is a full-length portrait of one of the notable rulers of the Orient, who united the despotism of the unspeakable tyrant with irate paternalism and the affability of an Eastern gentleman. Here again what is typical of the Oriental finds a clear delineation and a sympathetic interpretation.

Apart from the lucid light thrown on countries and peoples, this book is worth reading for the sake of the limpid style, which recalls the finest models of English writing. Without doubt this is one of the greatest books of travel of recent times.

OSCAR L. JOSEPH.

Plainfield, N. J.

Freedom of the Mind in History. By HENRY OSBORN TAYLOR. New York: The Macmillan Company. Price, \$2.25.

THIS volume sums up the investigations of Doctor Taylor, which he has set forth with such unusual historical scholarship in *The Mediæval Mind, Thought and Expression in the Sixteenth Century, Prophets, Poets and Philosophers of the Ancient World*, and other volumes. He regards

progress as a movement "toward a more complete and inclusive freedom." He is aware that "the full-minded man of many sympathies is a working union of inconsistencies"; that "man the investigator remains the measure and criterion of the truth of things which he discovers"; that "man did not start himself but seems the creature somehow of a God, a God who is spirit, who is love, who is all the valid qualities that can be found in man." He is further convinced that "Reason to-day is no more the exclusive vehicle of truth than it has been in the past. We must trust the whole man."

These sentiments are the conclusions made after a thorough consideration of all the facts. The present volume is a careful study of the course of political, intellectual and religious freedom. He first takes us through the growth of political institutions in Greece and Rome; then notes the contributions made by the religion, philosophy and science of the older world toward freedom from fear and fatalism. This is followed by an exposition of the attempts for religious freedom inaugurated by Luther and Calvin; for intellectual freedom by Descartes, Locke, Hume, Kant; and for the fullest freedom during the modern era by mathematics and the physical sciences. This remarkably compact and interesting review of "the factors of human progress and the manner of their operation," is concluded with a discussion of the work of art and literature for freedom.

The final chapter is reassuring. Wonder has led man on, and so long as this spirit possesses him, the sense of reverence will not depart from him and he will continue to be a wiser learner and a better doer. "Through many conflicts and in many ways, but always in the way of freedom, the human soul has been emerging, and has been gathering, as it were, affinity to God, in whom lies its immortality." Surely it is better farther on. A historian who thus enables us to thank God and take courage deserves our gratitude.

OSCAR L. JOSEPH.

Ethics in Theory and Application. By HORATIO W. DRESSER, Ph.D. Pp. xviii + 509. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Company. Price, \$3.

THE most casual perusal of this book must lead one to speak a complimentary word concerning its general make-up. It is a book well made, and the Crowell Company should feel proud in placing this book in the hands of students and the general public. This book is divided into three parts: Part I deals with "The Basis of Ethics"; Part II, "Goodness and Freedom"; Part III, "The Moral Life." There are twenty-nine chapters in this book covering the entire field of Ethics. The book is splendidly adapted for reference work, each paragraph being set off with a topic in heavy type. It is adapted to the college classroom and the pastor's study.

Doctor Dresser has already prepared the way for his new book by his splendid treatment of *Psychology in Theory and Application*. It is refreshing to read a book which so completely correlates the theories and the facts of life. The author has rightly entitled his new book *Ethics in*

Theory and Application. Now, it matters little whether we think in terms of the Epicureans and their pursuit of pleasure, or of the self-mastery of the Stoics, or the principles of Plato, or, in terms of the Christian religion, this book will lead us to the heart of the matter. Since the World War in the field of Ethics as elsewhere the thinking of men has been much confused and our moral foundations have been undermined, therefore this book is a timely book and it is no small tribute to say that it will lead us to think more clearly and to walk more uprightly. Anyone who increases the ethical knowledge of the race confers a blessing upon humanity. Ethics, being the Science of Conduct, is not a purely practical science. It does not pretend to tell individuals what to do; but it considers the actions of human beings with reference to their rightness or their wrongness. Doctor Dresser is of opinion that the Christian Church plays too much on "self-sacrifice," which possibly helps in the glorification of war. It has been customary to assume that Christianity and "self-sacrifice" are identical, and to accept self-sacrifice as good without criticism. The implication is that the man who gives up all is an exemplification of the ideal which we should realize. Self-sacrifice has been advocated unqualifiedly despite the fact that men and women of certain types tend to yield over-much while the majority dedicate too little of themselves and their possessions!

But whatever your philosophy of life may be, you will not have gone far in the fight for character without discovering that character is a very costly thing. There is no form of "conduct" that can produce character cheaply. This book contains a strong plea for that kind of individual "character" and international "ethics" which alone can produce and maintain the permanent peace of the world.

LEWIS KEAST.

Ishpeming, Mich.

BOOKS IN BRIEF

Native Churches in Foreign Fields. By HENRY HOSIE ROWLAND. (Methodist Book Concern, \$1.50.) One of the most important of modern missionary problems is that of creating indigenous churches. Surely that is what the holy apostles did in the primitive Church. Religion must be adapted to national and racial needs. Churches should become as rapidly as possible independent both in their administration and their self-support. The years of service in North China gave this author ample opportunity to study this subject. He furnishes a fine historical survey of Christian history from the apostles to Constantine and from Constantine to Carey, and suggests many excellent solutions of the problems presently faced. This is the road on which we must march to the Church Universal.

The Credibility of the Virgin Birth. By ORVILLE E. CRAIN. (Abingdon Press, 50 cents.) Current controversy is sanely met in this able contribution to this much debated question. He deals with the history of the question, explains the tests for historic belief, analyzes the sources of

testimony both critically and hermeneutically, answers the various opposing "Influence theories," introduces secondary witnesses, and shows the value of this historic fact to the Church. There is no recent brief handbook on this subject of higher worth.

A Covenant-Keeping God. By FRANCIS WESLEY WARNE. (Methodist Book Concern, 50 cents.) This "Narrative of Personal Experiences" is a noble example of spiritual autobiography. Few finer records of the inner life have been made. His boyhood with its religious training and experience, his entrance into the Abiding Life, his conscious call to the ministry, his pastoral and missionary experiences—all are told by Bishop Warne from this spiritual standpoint. Only by personal testimony can the world be won. We need a witnessing Church—would that its ministry and laity were full not of warning but of Warnes!

Imprisonment. By BERNARD SHAW. (Brentanos, 75 cents.) This brilliant essay upon a problem which has not yet been solved even by modern so-called humanitarianism was published several years ago as an introduction to *Prisons under Local Government*. It is now brought out separately by the Department of Social Service of the National Council of the Protestant Episcopal Church in America. It is a real eye-opener as to the hideous conditions even of present penology. It is too often a "horrible, wicked and wasteful thing." Even the criminal has rights that must be respected. To neglect them is to destroy all the morality left in him. Bernard Shaw has a program which would not only revolutionize the jail—it would become prevention of crime. Shall our communities continue the present disgrace and our country submit to such awful outbreaks on its institutions and ideals?

Dear Family. By PEGGY ANN. (Abingdon Press, 75 cents.) Peggy is a mission teacher in South America. She had the real missionary stuff in her, but it took her work and her experience to bring it out. She found out that it is better to live Americanism down there than to talk too much about it. She soon learned that "natives" have qualities one might be glad to acquire. So she was metamorphosed into a real missionary girl. The last sentence in the last letter to her *Dear Family* marks her final achievement. "There's nothing like being a missionary; it's the life!" This is not merely a lesson for missionaries, however, it is a message that will help us all in religious work.

Christ in High School Life. By RALPH P. CLAGGETT. (Abingdon Press, \$1.00.) This treats such problems of boys and girls of this age as their current ailments and the cures for them, the needful guides to successful living, and the real keys to the Kingdom, and deals with them in a most practical way by furnishing a handbook for their daily devotions. The principles of Jesus are applied to these problems. Boys of the high school age are far more deeply religious than is commonly thought.

Verses by the Way. By JAMES HENRY DARLINGTON. (Brentanos, \$1.50.) Bishop Darlington has issued a second series of lyrics. While he may not be counted among the greatest poets, his verses are filled with a rhythmic atmosphere which is full of natural beauty and spiritual

fervor. The minister should be a musician and the preacher a poet. Bishop Darlington of Harrisburg does live in a realm both of art and life.

Social Ethics. By JAMES MELVILLE COLEMAN. (Revell, \$1.25.) This is a third edition of a quite excellent treatment of social and political questions from the Christian standpoint. Surely "if the powers that be are ordained of God," the state ought to become a religious institution. Professor Coleman very ably wipes out that mischievous modern mechanical system of ethics improperly based on the materialistic form of evolution. While he does not sufficiently apply the ethics of Jesus to economic and industrial problems, probably those who absorb his teaching will be compelled to revolutionize their present attitude on these questions.

Studies in Criticism and Revelation. By THOMAS JOLLIE SMITH. (Revell, \$1.50.) This Australian professor quite properly attacks naturalism in religious criticism, but does not seem to know that it is possible to accept the modern reconstruction of Old Testament literature and history without denying supernaturalism. The real problem is not the fact of divine revelation but its method. Like most traditionalists he does not seem to comprehend this principle. Most of us will agree with this sensible statement of F. W. Norwood, who writes the introduction to this book: "I do not find myself in entire agreement with him." It is only fair to say, however, that the author has kept himself quite free from personalities and indecent attacks upon the critics whose views he opposes.

A Way to Peace, Health and Power. By BERTHA CONDÉ. (Scribners, \$1.50.) Such a textbook for religious education is something new and different, for it is made up of fifty-two studies for the inner life. Surely the spirit needs training as much as the body and the mind, and the last two will gain in strength and culture as the first grows in holiness. This secret of power will certainly come to those who learn to walk this way. It is worth far more than most treatises on faith-cure. Why not take it and use it as a devotional handbook for the full year? It will help to secure a connecting current between the human spirit and God. Utterly modern in its methods, it finds the way in Jesus Christ.

Mental Hygiene as Taught by Jesus. By ALEXANDER B. MACLEOD. (Macmillan, \$1.50.) This quite scholarly treatise deals with features similar to some in Miss Condé's book noticed above. Certainly the pedagogy of Jesus was meant for the training of the whole of manhood. Spiritual growth does involve mental health and will burgeon into perfected social relations. There is no dynamic for all life equal to the Spirit of Christ.

The Necessity of Art. Edited by PERCY DEARMER (Doran, \$3). Art is not the cult of leisured classes but a medium of expression for all people. It helps to get rid of banality and guards us against the perils of standardization and the resulting monotony that comes from utilitarian tests. These essays deal with "Christianity and Art," "The Puritan Objection to Art," "The Artist and the Saint," "Literature and Religion," "The Doctrine of Values," and other related themes. They suggest some

ways of culture that should be followed for the tempering of morals and manners so closely related to the religion of the Incarnation.

Richard Baxter, Puritan and Mystic. By A. R. LADELL (Macmillan, \$2). The Puritan as a member of the hard church was given to modes of repression which tended to restrict life. But it was a timely protest against the indulgences of those who belonged to the soft church, lacking as they were in moral vigor and spiritual power. This exposition of Puritanism is far more impartial and judicious than that of some cynical interpreters such as Macaulay. For this reason alone the book is worth reading, although the views of Baxter as a mystic need to be modified. It is well, however, to give the author of "The Reformed Pastor" another introduction to the present generation.

Prayer That Prevails. By MARSHALL DAWSON (Macmillan, \$2). "A man's religion is never so truly known as when he is overheard in prayer." Indeed, religion is prayer and rather than exhortations we need encouragements in the practice of this supreme art. This book offers suggestions how it is to be done. The discussion of the technique of prayer is followed by a large selection of prayers for every mood and condition. Many will be stimulated to take advantage of this neglected benefit for the recovery of their latent resources and for the realization of the fullest joy in life.

Prayers for Women Workers. By Mrs. GEORGE H. MORRISON (Doran, \$1.25). This selection of morning and evening prayers and of prayers for missionary and other meetings should help women to formulate their supplications and give apt expression to the devotional spirit. It deserves to be widely known and largely used.

The Bible in Scots Literature. By JAMES MOFFATT (Doran, \$3). Our indebtedness to Scotch writers can never be repaid. Doctor Moffatt shows that the literature of Scotland was largely influenced by the Bible. From his extensive stores of reading he marshals illustrations that cover the period from the fourteenth to the nineteenth century in support of his thesis. This impact of the Bible upon verse and prose was largely due to pictures, religious plays, sculpture and preaching. The last two chapters are specially valuable on Burns and Scott, whose deep knowledge and appreciation of the Bible inflamed their genius. Doctor Moffatt closes his survey with Sir Walter, after whom anything would come as an anti-climax, more or less. And yet who would have complained if there had been some references to R. L. Stevenson, Barrie, and Ian Mac-laren? This volume is a welcome contribution to the study of comparative literature and a glowing testimony to the power of The Book.

The Earth Speaks to Bryan. By HENRY FAIRFIELD OSBORN (Scribners, \$1). This brochure is well worth reading. Its value is not in its controversial features but in the definite declarations of a naturalist of his faith that living Nature is purposive and full of moral and spiritual force. "The moral principle inherent in evolution is that nothing can be gained in this world without an effort; the ethical principle inherent in evolution is that only the best has the right to survive; the spiritual principle in evolution is the evidence of beauty, of order, and of design in the daily

myriad of miracles to which we owe our existence." There cannot be a better summing up of the testimony of science and religion.

Before the Dawn. By TOYOHICO KAGAWA (Doran, \$2.50). In the guise of fiction this Japanese graduate of Princeton relates the story of his life with picturesque vividness. He has earned the title of "The Saint Francis of Japan." His understanding of labor conditions, his knowledge of Christian thought, his activities in social and Christian service as novelist, economist, evangelist and editor have given him a high place in Japanese Christianity. Three hundred editions of this book were sold in two years in Japan. Its translation is most fortunate for all who wish to know of the power of the living Christ in the Far East. Kagawa's conviction is well expressed in the words: "Christianity alone will polarize the iron fragments of humanity."

Realities and Shams. By L. P. JACKS (Doran, \$1.50). Doctor Jacks gives a new setting to Carlyle's gospel of work. These brief essays are provocative and illuminative, and furnish the best antidote to much current cynicism. Many popular obsessions and panaceas are exposed. Doctor Jacks at times disguises his thought in idealistic phrases that are as unreal as the man in the moon, but the total impression of the book is wholesome, and this sort of preaching is beneficial.

Mothers and Daughters. By JESSICA G. COSGRAVE (Doran, \$1.50). This is a book of experiences interspersed with practical counsels by a mother and a teacher of girls, who understands their reactions. It is a manual for parents and their daughters, facing the trying problems of our day and perplexed how to solve them.

A READING COURSE

The Mystery-Religions and Christianity. A Study in the Religious Background of Early Christianity. By S. ANGUS, Ph.D., D.Litt., D.D. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. Price, \$3.50.

LORD ACTON's Inaugural Address on "The Study of History" is a classic utterance. It was delivered when he became Regius Professor of Modern History at the University of Cambridge in 1895. His pertinent observations offer needed guidance. "History compels us to fasten on abiding issues and rescues us from the temporary and the transient. If the Past has been an obstacle and a burden, knowledge of the Past is the safest and surest emancipation. Unlike the dreaming prehistoric world, ours knows the need and the duty to make itself master of the earlier times, and to forfeit nothing of their wisdom or their warnings, and has devoted its best energy and treasure to the sovereign purpose of detecting error and of vindicating entrusted truth." The last three words of this pregnant quotation emphasize our responsibility as preachers. A sense of perspective can be obtained only as we relate the present to the past and both to the future. But we must first know the past before we discriminate between what is of permanent and of temporary worth.

A knowledge of the past, with reference to the beginnings of Chris-

tianity, is of the utmost importance. Its origins are historical and not mythical. The panorama of faith, adventure and triumph during the centuries impressively demonstrates the fact that every advance was due to the vitalizing initiative of our blessed Lord, who is the Eternal Christ of the church's confession and consecration. It is the truth of his acknowledged supremacy that explains the attitude of the early Christians to contemporary faiths. They could not compromise with the cult of Emperor-worship, of Mithra and of the Mystery Religions because it was out of the question to bring Christ into the pantheon of the gods or to regard him even as *primus inter pares*. He was unique and incomparable, and his deed of redemption gave him an undisputed primacy that justified his claim to control all life. The intolerance of the Christians was not a form of bigotry but a mark of their earnestness and enthusiasm in pressing the issue, which was the alternative of all for Christ or nothing for Christ. The pagans were hospitable to every type of faith and of unfaith. From their standpoint they were consistent in participating in Emperor-worship and in the worship of their ancestral gods. But the Christians could not be at home in two rival camps at the same time. It was a case of Christ or Cæsar. What was regarded as narrowness or churlishness was really the secret of their strength. All the other religions of the first century began to decay in their prime and eventually disappeared. On the other hand, Christianity increased in power and multiplied its influence and has so continued.

These are some of the facts discussed by Doctor Angus in his notable volume. Scientific in method, thorough in historical and philosophical learning, deep in the knowledge of comparative religion and wide in sympathy with the religious impulse, his exposition is impartial and comprehensive. He furthermore writes as one who is convinced that Christianity won out in the early centuries because it satisfied the deepest needs of mankind better than any other religious system. The book is thus a valuable introduction to the study of the many religions that strenuously competed with Christianity when it began its course to redeem, to renew and to remake human life. An intense study of these rival faiths will reward us in giving a clearer understanding of the powerful religious forces that confronted Christianity. It will also deepen our appreciation of the notable contribution made by the gospel and show us how we are to use its unlimited resources for the work of our own day.

Let it not be forgotten that Christianity was engaged from the outset in a life-and-death struggle. It has not been different through the centuries. The forces that would subvert its influence and prevent its extension are still with us although their character and complexion have changed. We must not assume to rely on the past as though that were an adequate apologetic for the truth of Christianity. Unless it is still working spiritual and moral miracles it is an antiquated faith, to be surpassed by something better adapted to modern needs. We do not believe that this is so. It is therefore part of our obligation as preachers to declare the vibrancy and virility of our holy Faith and to set it in a

large context, in order that its perennial capacity to bring men to God through Christ may be demonstrated in every walk of life.

In some respects the modern situation is similar to that of the early centuries. The erratic cults that thrive on the ignorance, superstition and credulity of earnest souls have a remote ancestry. One issue that we must face is the conflict between the hocus-pocus of Oriental vagaries with their excessive emotionalism and the lucid thinking of Occidental knowledge, which insists on reckoning with the whole of life. If we believe that Christianity is the only universal religion for all classes and conditions, we should give proof of the scope and variety of its appeal in terms of the "Edict of Comprehension," as Seeley so well characterized the Sermon on the Mount. Indeed, it was the emphasis on Christ as "the historic and personal center," and as "the realized ideal," that always won triumphs. It must be the same in this day of random guesses, evasive compromises, shortsighted panaceas.

The spirit in which Doctor Angus undertakes this investigation is seen in his appreciative reference to Clement of Alexandria. This great teacher pointed out in *The Stromata* that "the barbarian and Hellenic philosophy has torn off a fragment of eternal truth not from the mythology of Dionysus but from the theology of the ever living Word." There is only one River of Truth but we cannot ignore or despise the many tributaries that flow into it. Nor can we do justice to the victory of Christianity in the early centuries unless we consider the moral and spiritual values of Hellenistic-Oriental paganism. Every religion, moreover, should be judged at its best and not only at its worst. It would be a caricature of early Christianity if we confined our attention to the unattractive picture of dissension in the church at Corinth and overlooked the other Christian communities, where the devout lives of earnest believers bore radiant testimony in deeds of heroic rectitude, sustained charity and sacrificial endurance. Similar impartial consideration should be given to paganism. It will not redound to the glory of Christianity to deprecate excellencies of character outside its influence, to explain away coincidences and similarities, or to deny to non-Christian forms of conduct virtues they actually possessed. The sympathetic attitude which is also open-minded is more honorable, for it regards every religion as a *preparatio evangelica* for Christianity. Its credentials are sustained by Christian lives of purity and helpfulness, which demonstrate its uniqueness far more forcibly than by mere argumentative acumen.

The whole situation should then be viewed from many angles. This subject was finely treated by Doctor Angus in a previous volume on *The Environment of Early Christianity*. It was necessarily a brief discussion, but, a master of the subject, he furnished an accurate and discerning exposition of all the factors and gave a right perspective of Christianity by placing it in contrast and in contact with its environment. The larger volume goes into details and furnishes "chapter and verse" in support of all the statements made in keeping with balanced scholarship. This is important, for a great deal of amateurish reasoning in popular books is based upon unexamined and irrelevant data that misrepresent the facts

and mislead the unlearned. We are also grateful for his extended quotations because the original texts can be studied only by a few. Yet without a knowledge of them we cannot understand how "the simplicity and purity that is toward Christ" supplanted the varieties of ancient magic, theosophy, occultism and the philosophies of Stoicism, Neo-Pythagoreanism, and Neo-Platonism.

The first chapter fittingly deals with "Orientation: the historical crises of the Græco-Roman world in their bearing upon the Mystery Religions and Christianity." Note what is said about the unprecedented *rapprochement* between the Orient and the Occident and the causes that produced it. Why was this age morally and religiously bankrupt? Why had philosophy failed to satisfy the yearnings of the soul? The world of mankind was open but the way to God and peace was distractingly confusing. The ubiquitous Jew was engaged in religious propaganda but the animus of anti-Semitism repeatedly exposed him to persecution and expulsion. How is this explained? (p. 22ff.) Read a recent volume, *Stranger Than Fiction*, by Lewis Browne, for a revelation of some facts about the Jew. In view of some modern movements, note why religious syncretism and eclecticism failed.

The mystery cults had much to commend them. The symbolism of nature concerning the phenomena of death and rebirth was expounded in its application to the life and hope of man. It conveyed the significance of impalpable experiences, strengthened by materialistic pantheism and allegorical interpretation. The offer of redemption professed to remove estrangement between man and God. What was the elaborate ritualistic apparatus used? and note the strategy in appealing to the mysterious and the spectacular (58ff.). The chapter on "The Three Stages of a Mystery Religion" is a full exposition of the rites of preparation and probation, of initiation and communion, of blessedness and salvation. What were the conditions favorable to the spread of the mysteries? (144ff.) The religious *milieu* in which they were planted consisted of several factors. One was individualism, which often took the form of selfishness. Another was syncretism, due to intermarriages, migrations and religious hospitality without discernment. Yet other factors were the multiplication of brotherhoods or guilds, the consciousness of failure, the practices of asceticism, and the craving for salvation as deliverance from ills more than as communion with God.

It will thus be seen that Christianity encountered formidable rivalries from these sources. The outcome was favorable to Christianity because it was so distinctively unlike the mysteries in its essential truths and because it actually gave what it promised. This is well discussed in the chapter on "Christianity and the Mystery Religions in Contrast." There was doubtless much in the mysteries that justifies their being described as an evangel. Some of the prayers quoted by Doctor Angus are pathetic and impressive (240ff.). The religious and ethical value of these religions was also considerable. Why, then, did they fail and the religion of Jesus triumph? They were freighted with myths of primitive naturalism, linked with the pseudo-science of astrology and the pseudo-religion of

magic, did not hold the social and religious instincts of man in equipoise, appealed primarily to feeling rather than to the moral loyalties and spiritual perceptions. These points are carefully analyzed. Christianity was historical, rational, ethical and spiritual. It consistently "construed under the forms of reason what had first been vouchsafed to faith," and it substantiated its superiority and adaptability by the acid test of tangible results. The outstanding facts that ensured the success and permanence of Christianity are searchingly examined. Reference has already been made to intolerance. Among the others were universality, that genuinely made room for all nationalities; faith, as a form of allegiance and obedience to Christ; the Greek Bible,* as the supernatural source of knowledge by Revelation; a satisfying message for the widespread sorrow of the world; an historic and personal Center in Jesus Christ. The last item was the most significant. The unique holiness and power of the person of Christ were in direct contrast to the mythical Mithra, the idealized Isis, the speculative Logos, and the Gnostic emanations, none of which furnished the dynamic as did our Lord, to produce justification, sanctification and redemption. This was the conviction from experience that made Christianity irresistible and inspirational. Such must also be our conviction as we resolve to bring all peoples to Him who is the Saviour of the world and the Lord of glory.

Side Reading

The Golden Bough. By J. G. FRAZER (Macmillan, \$5). A veritable treasury of myths, legends, magic, superstitions and ceremonials that testify to the irrepressible instinct of religion in mankind. Our gratitude for the superb revelation in Christ is intensified by this inviting study of contrasts under the guidance of one of the most eminent anthropologists.

The Conflict of Religions in the Early Roman Empire. By T. R. GLOVER (Scribners, \$2.50). A vivid portrayal of the ancient world in a pitiful welter of half-truths, finding its way to the magnetic center, not through institutional forms but by the personal acceptance of Jesus Christ as the living Redeemer. Doctor Glover succeeds in showing how the Christian movement changed the thoughts and lives of men and gave them salvation, peace and blessedness.

The Religious Thought of the Greeks. By CLIFFORD H. MOORE (Harvard University Press, \$4). An historical survey from Homer to Origen dealing with the higher ranges of Greek thought, the interactions between Greek philosophy and Oriental mysteries, the influence of Christianity which gave much and transformed what little it received for the furtherance of the Evangel of redemption.

[Mystery Religions and the New Testament. By HENRY CLAY SHELDON. This brief book is one of the highest value on the question: Are mystery religions sources of any part of the New Testament?—EDITOR.]

For further information about books on subjects of interest to preachers, address this department, *Reading Course*, care of the METHODIST REVIEW, 150 Fifth Avenue, New York City.

OSCAR L. JOSEPH.

CONTENTS

	PAGE
I. ANCIENT MOVIES OF MODERN LIFE.....	839
Professor KARL P. HARRINGTON, A.M., Middletown, Conn.	
II. A BROADCAST BIBLE.....	858
WILLIAM E. TILBOE, D.D., Los Angeles, Cal.	
III. HERRMANN'S "DOGMATIK".....	867
Professor JOHN R. VAN PELT, Ph.D., D.D., Atlanta, Ga.	
IV. THE RED LAUGH.....	875
Reverend GEORGE MACADAM, Glencoe, Ill.	
V. MILITARISM AND INDIA'S VISION OF CHRIST'S METHOD FOR WORLD PEACE.....	890
Professor JOHN JESUDASON CORNELIUS, Ph.D., Lucknow, India.	
VI. THE PREPARATION OF PEACE.....	904
WILLIAM H. SHIPMAN, D.D., Des Moines, Ia.	
VII. THE DOMESTICATION OF THE FIGHTING URGE.....	914
Professor KARL R. STOLZ, Ph.D., Chicago, Ill.	
VIII. HUXLEY AND THE PREACHER.....	922
Reverend GILBERT QUINN LESOURD, Ph.D., New York City.	
IX. INTELLECT AND LIFE.....	930
GEORGE PRESTON MAINS, D.D., LL.D., Altadena, Cal.	
X. THINGS "HOLY".....	938
MARY BEAL HOUSEL, Vienna, Austria.	
XI. AS A LITTLE CHILD.....	944
Professor WILLIAM L. BAILEY, Ph.D., Evanston, Ill.	
XII. POEMS. Tragedy and Moonrise (An Oriental Fragment), 857; The Burning Bush (Hafiz), 943. Bethlehem (Pauline Carrington Bouvé), 948; Their Star, (Harry Webb Farrington), 949.	
 EDITORIAL DEPARTMENTS:	
NOTES AND DISCUSSIONS.....	949
Bimonthly Brevities, 949: Faith of Our Fathers, 953: Judgment by the Son of Man, 958.	
THE HOUSE OF THE INTERPRETER.....	963
The Macedonian Cry, 963.	
THE ARENA.....	971
"Moses said, but I say," 971: The Sky-Scraper of the Apocalypse, 973.	
BIBLICAL RESEARCH.....	974
The Parthenogenetic Problem of Christianity (Conclusion), 974.	
FOREIGN OUTLOOK.....	978
Is Asia a Menace to World Peace? 978.	
BOOK NOTICES.....	980
Biographical Books, 980; Hough's Evangelical Humanism, 981; Dutcher's The Political Awakening of the East, 983; Mouzon's The Missionary Evangel, 985; Hollander's Economic Liberalism, 986; The Diary of a Country Parson: the Rev. James Woodforde, 988; Metcalf's American Writers and Compilers of Sacred Music, 988; Patrick's Introduction to Philosophy, 990; Luccock's The East Window and Other Sermons, 991; Joseph's The Historical Development of Christianity, 992; Rice's The Advantages of a Handicap, 993; Kittel's Die Hellenistische Mysterien-religion und das Alte Testament, 994; Howard's Peril of Power, 995; Books on Religious Education (18), 996; Books in Brief, 999.	
READING COURSE.....	1000
The Christian Gospel of the Fatherhood of God. By John MacIntosh Shaw, D.D., 1001.	
INDEX OF METHODIST REVIEW, 1925.....	1005

WHO'S WHO IN THE REVIEW

KARL POMEROY HARRINGTON, professor of Latin in Wesleyan University, Middletown, Conn., is author of books, composer of songs and tunes, supervisor of tralls and possesses many other versatile gifts. WILLIAM EDWIN TILROE, D.D., is professor of historical theology in the University of Southern California. JOHN ROBERT VAN PELT, Ph.D., teaches homiletics in Gammon Theological Seminary, Atlanta, Ga. He is the author of a most valuable book: *An Introduction to the Bible*.

The Reverend GEORGE MACADAM is a Methodist minister at Glencoe, Ill. WILLIAM H. SHIPMAN, D.D., is a retired preacher to whom Methodism is largely indebted for the removal of its doctrinal test of membership. JOHN JESUDASON CORNELIUS, Ph.D., a leading scholar and teacher of the Indian Race, professor of philosophy at Lucknow, India, is now in America doing post-graduate study as a preparation for fuller missionary education in his native land. KARL R. STOLZ, Ph.D., teaches in the Y. M. C. A. College, Chicago, Ill.

The Reverend GILBERT QUINN LE SOURD, Ph.D., is a leader in the educational department of the Methodist Board of Foreign Missions in New York City. GEORGE PRESTON MAINS, D.D., LL.D., former publishing agent of The Methodist Book Concern, now past four score years, is still keen in intellect and vigorous in life.

Mrs. MARY BEAL HOUSEL is without doubt connected with valuable religious work in Vienna, Austria. WILLIAM L. BAILEY, Ph.D., is a professor of sociology in Northwestern University, Evanston, Ill.

Among our poets for this issue are Mrs. PAULINE CARRINGTON BOUVE, of New York City, and Major HARRY WEBB FARRINGTON, of Interlaken, N. J.

Other contributors in this issue of the REVIEW have been previously introduced to its readers.